THE SUNDAY SCHOOL QUARTERLY

VOL. II JULY, 1910 No. 2

FROEBEL AND THE RELIGIOUS DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN

E. R. MURRAY

RELIGIOUS education or religious development is so important and so full of difficulties, that few would wish to dogmatise about it. For my part, I feel more able to state difficulties than to solve them. But at the outset I should like to strike a note of hope. At present no one is satisfied. That means progress. If we have nothing else just now, at least we have divine discontent. It seems as if the angel had come down from above to stir the waters of all Sunday School Associations and Unions to their depths. There is hope in the metaphor, for the waters were *healing* waters only when they were moving, only when they were troubled, not when they were calm, peaceful, and clear, but when the depths were stirred, when the waters were cloudy—even muddy.

We can certainly say of religious affairs and of educational affairs just now that they are restless, stirred up. If the stirring is of the spirit of God, then the waters, even if muddy, are still healing waters.

A member of your Committee was kind enough to lend me the report of your Association for 1909, and among its opening sentences I find a passage which possibly means more to the body of trained teachers whom I for the present represent than it can possibly mean to those who have not been specially trained to teach :—

'As the years go on, the time seems to be approaching when the Sunday school will be called upon to take up a more responsible position in respect to National education. The Council schools, it is believed by many persons, will at no distant date be limited to providing so-called secular instruction, leaving the religious teaching to other agencies, more especially to the Sunday schools' (p. 6).

This is to me a very serious position. I stand of course for the training of teachers, and the more thorough the better. In the old days, a teacher was considered qualified if he knew his subject—it is so still in many quarters, and unfortunately in influential quarters. The idea was—and is !—'I, the teacher, know what you, the pupil, do not know ; listen to me and I will supply you with the valuable information.' In a book on the 'Reform of Sunday School Teaching,' published within the last few years, in which there is much that is valuable, I found the statement that what the teacher needs is a basis of general Biblical and theological knowledge, that he often has not sufficient Biblical knowledge to make the best use of the fragments with which he is dealing, and that accordingly a system of lectures by experts would do much to raise the quality of Sunday school instruction. No doubt it would improve the quality of the instruction, the teacher would know his subject better, but that is only half the battle.

Among educationalists nowadays the teacher is supposed to know something even more important than his subject ; he ought to know the child—to know how mind develops, to know what ideas the child can grasp—by what means he does grasp ideas, and how these ideas are likely to affect his conduct as a human being.

[1] A paper read at the Annual Meeting of the Sunday School Association, Whit-week, 1910.

Some of us at least have come to realise that the word 'development' is the master word for education, and it is the glory of Froebel that at a time when that word, with what it implies, was the property of scientists alone, before Herbert Spencer, before Darwin and Wallace, he had not only grasped its highest meaning—I say that advisedly—but had actually applied it to education. He knew what everyone knows nowadays, that there are stages in the development of the human being, just as there are stages in the development of the butterfly or of the frog, and that it is as fatal to treat the child as if he were only a little man as it would be to treat the tadpole as if it were only a little frog. We hear a great deal about infant mortality just now, and it is well known that much of this is the result of improper feeding, of giving to the infant food only suited for adults.

Sometimes in the case of the child it is not the body which is starved but the mind. The mind grows through the ideas it feeds upon, and what is so hard for us to take in is that ideas suited to adults are quite unsuited to children.

On glancing through your hymn book, for example, among the many well written and well chosen hymns, my eye lit on a verse :—

> 'Lord, thy children guide and keep,
> As with feeble steps they press
> On the pathway rough and steep
> Through this weary wilderness.'

At what age, may we ask, are children expected to look upon life as a weary wilderness ?

Another hymn runs :—

> 'Holy Father, life is fair ;
> I have known no secret care.'

What do the words 'secret care' mean to a child ?

'Childhood,' as Rousseau said one hundred and fifty years ago, 'has its own ways of seeing, thinking and feeling.'

The first point then that we have to remember is that we must give to a developing organism just what it needs at the stage at which it has arrived.

How are we to know what it needs ? That is the question upon which all real educators are engaged. Speaking *very* generally we can say that the child knows better than we do what he needs at each stage of development. Nature has provided him with instincts which we used to check but which now we are beginning to foster.

As a consequence of the struggle for adaptation all animals have become provided with what we call instincts, they are controlled by a force which obliges them to perform certain actions beneficial to their species.

Bees do not *learn* how to build their wonderful comb, or how to take their part in the complicated society of which they are members.

It is clear that any species of animal, which came into the world with instinctive desires to perform actions which are harmful to it, would very soon die out ; it would never even become a species.

Still, it is only recently that it has occurred to anyone that a child might possibly know what is good for him. Not that he knows this consciously, but he knows what he likes ; and more and more we are discovering that, still speaking in general terms, what he likes is good for him, probably best for him.

If there is anyone here who has never had this view put before him, it may sound somewhat shocking. It is none the less true. When we were children we used to love a story of my father's, how he was offered sixpence when he was a little fellow, if he would sit still for fifteen minutes ; but he never could gain the sixpence. We smile because we know how impossible is that fifteen minutes' stillness to a restless small boy. Are children restless just from pure perversity ? For they always were and always are restless unless they are ill. Not at all ; there is no perversity, but movement is essential to the development of their bodies and of their brains. So Nature is urging all the time, 'Move, move, swing your legs, employ your hands, look at everything you can, touch everything within reach, climb up everything possible, imitate horse and dog, father and mother ; in short, play, play, play.'

It was because Froebel was a biologist that he founded the Kindergarten which is established upon the theory that play is a child's work.

There is a common misconception of the theory underlying the Kindergarten, viz., that it involves turning work into play,

making lessons amusing, hiding the powder in jam. That is entirely false.

In a real Kindergarten play is play, but it is the play of a child not that of an adult, which is usually relaxation and may be mere amusement, or possibly mere excitement.

What we call play on the part of the child is simply the carrying out of his natural instincts, and it is as necessary to him as to other young animals. He cannot sit still because Nature is urging him to move.

There is a stage at which the infant puts everything into his mouth and tries to chew it. Nature tells him so to help his teeth to develop. There is a stage at which he babbles unmeaning noises. Nature tells him so to prepare his lips and tongue, that he may later be able to pronounce words. There is a stage at which he touches everything, experiments with everything, and breaks many things. Nature has provided him with an instinct of investigation ; she means him to master his surroundings, to develop his brain power by ceaseless investigation and experiment, as well as by ceaseless questioning.

Among the natural likings comes the young child's love of literature, of good stories and good poetry, but instead of giving him what he likes by telling him good stories, and so fostering a literary taste, we have taught him an alphabet which means nothing at all. The little child is an artist too, delighting in colour, and ready to express any thought ; he is an experimental scientist and a busy workman, but we have stopped his science because it is untidy, and his business because he gets in our own way. Then later we wonder why boys and girls are not easy to interest in literature, in art, and in science, and are not always ready to help.

The Kindergarten is simply an attempt to educate the human being at a very early stage by providing suitable surroundings, including opportunity for action with or without material, for all educators are now agreed that Froebel was right in saying that only by action of some sort can a young child take in ideas.

I believe that firmly, and yet though I respect and admire the energy and earnestness of those who are trying to reform the Sunday school by introducing what are called kindergarten methods, I cannot always feel in sympathy with them. In our day schools we do encourage the children to act out stories, to dramatise the Three Bears, to make a meadow in the sand tray for Baa Baa Black Sheep, to make pictures of Jack and Jill climbing the hill for water, and their abrupt descent.

But when I hear of children modelling the horn of oil, after they have been told the story of David the shepherd boy being anointed by the prophet Samuel ; or being taught to act ' The Good Samaritan ' in the Sunday school, it does not appeal to me at all. I have read of some children acting out the story of the cleansing of the ten lepers. There were three children : Freddy, crippled from birth ; Louis, a little friend ; and Pinkie, a tiny girl cousin. Freddy represented the ten lepers and Pinkie all the disciples, while Louis acted the Christ. After the one leper had returned to give thanks, little Louis suddenly put out his hand with ' Stop, Freddy, I am going to cure you—Freddy, arise and walk ! ' The poor little cripple cried, ' Oh, Louis, I can't, I can't ! my legs aren't strong enough ' ; and while the mother's comforting arms enfolded Freddy, Louis took off the brightly coloured shawl in which he had draped himself, saying, ' It's no use, I don't want to be the Christ any more.'

I found that story very touching, and I see in it no trace of irreverence, and yet I do not like the idea of children being taught to act the Good Samaritan, etc. The difference lies in the fact that in the one case it is purely spontaneous, and in the other the suggestion came from without.

Our own children have abundant freedom to express what they like, and we constantly find them either dramatising or working out in the sand tray such stories as Water Babies, the Argonauts, and stories of the Romans and Britons. But I never see Bible stories acted out. I never have seen any attempt except one.

I believe the reason to be, that the children feel that the Bible stories are different—that there is a different atmosphere about them.

If I told the story of Samuel anointing David I should want to bring out the wonder that an ordinary little shepherd boy had been chosen by God to be king over all the people, and I should probably end by saying that perhaps God was calling

one of us to do some great thing for our people, and certainly he was calling us to do little things, and we had better be on the look out for them, and do them as well and bravely as David kept his sheep. I had rather let the children go with that impression than give out modelling clay and start modelling a horn. For I should not want attention concentrated on the horn or even on the ceremony of anointing, but on the fact that David had been chosen by God to do something great for his people. I should not want any more talk on the subject, and I do not expect children to sit quiet thinking on that subject while they model, as perhaps older people might do. If my story had not impressed what I wanted, the making of the horn in clay would not help.

Our children did model a horn lately, after a story on Roland, where the atmosphere was one of brave deeds on the battlefield, with soldiers and armour and so on. The modelling was not to impress the story, but because the children were interested in the horn and were intended to realise the appearance of a battle or hunting horn. The action I should want after the story of the anointing of David would be a better performance of small duties, in preparation for the larger ones that might follow.

I fancy that the stage at which every impression *must* come out in action is an earlier stage than the one to which I myself should tell Bible stories at all, but that must be a matter of opinion.

Development always means that there is something within which is to be developed by interaction with that which is without. If, then, we wish to further religious development, we must consider what germs there are in the child and how we can foster them.

Religion Froebel defined as a continually advancing endeavour, and he found its germ or germs in the sense that binds us together in what he calls 'the feeling of community.'

'This feeling of community, first uniting the child with mother, father, brothers and sisters . . . is the very first germ, the very first beginning of all true religious spirit, of all genuine yearning for unification with the Eternal.'

In this we have revealed the keynote of Froebel's being, his longing for union, for unity. In one of his letters he says that he does not like the word 'religion,' and would rather speak of 'Gott-einigkeit.' And this he says begins with the love between mother and child. This relationship must imply on the child's side a sense of dependence, an attitude of looking up for protection and help. Out of this comes admiration for those who possess what he does not possess—strength, knowledge, conrage, power of all kinds. Other attributes not in themselves admirable may be regarded as desirable just because they belong to the person whose superiority is undoubted. So, all little boys must smoke and many swear!

Some people would take this time of dependence as an opportunity for giving young children direct lessons on gratitude to parents and teachers. I should not. Indeed, I cannot imagine any teacher giving a lesson to children on gratitude to him or herself. But I should take the opportunity of bringing before the children the love of a mother, not necessarily of their own mother. In telling the story of the loss of Persephone, a teacher emphasised the weary wanderings of the bereaved mother, but a child said, 'She wouldn't mind about that! she was looking for her own little girl.' Instead of lessons on gratitude, it would be better to provide opportunities for service. Froebel says of his ideal child: 'Then, his love for her expressing, off he starts his mother serving.'

Our children were one day discussing the story of a mother who had climbed a dangerous cliff to rescue an infant carried off by an eagle, and one said, 'I should think any mother would do that for her own child,' to which another rejoined, 'And I should think any child would do that for his own mother.'

The feeling of dependence upon some one stronger, wiser, and presumably better than oneself must be one of the factors of that reverence, without which there can be no religious development at all. Froebel takes for granted that there is an atmosphere of reverence in the home, and expects the child to breathe it in as unconsciously as he breathes the air. Again he speaks of reverent gesture, the bowed head and folded hands, as 'the very awakening of the innermost religious life.' When the child 'says grace' over his doll's feast, Froebel warns the mother that 'this is no drawing down of the sacred into

outer life, it is the germ which gives outside actions an inner meaning. It is the way in which the child cultivates in himself 'a lively feeling of what is holy.' But, he adds, 'it must be done in this very innocence, called forth by unsummoned glance and speech from the sacredness of childhood's life, and not for show.'

It seems to me that to teach children to dramatise the Good Samaritan and other similar stories is not likely to deepen reverence, and it is because I desire to create a feeling of reverence that I am glad our children shew no desire to treat Bible stories like other stories. As early as possible, I desire for children something which is to be regarded as sacred, set apart. Not that religion can be kept apart from life, but that there can be little real religion without a Holy of Holies, whence we gather inspiration for life.

Probably we can all remember deep impressions made upon us when we were quite young—an impression which was not the result of an immediate expression.

Unfortunately we do not always get an atmosphere of reverence in the Sunday school. Difficulties of discipline are apt to stand in the way. A certain amount of instruction may be given, but it is difficult to see how anything which can fitly be called religious development can be going on, in a class which is inattentive, impudent, and unruly. It is here that I see the great difficulty. Knowing how long it takes teachers who are in full training,—who spend at least one whole year in studying education and practising teaching under skilled direction—to learn to handle a class, I do not see, if religious education as such is to be handed over to the Sunday schools, how really qualified teachers are to be provided.

It seems to me outrageous to force teachers to give religious instruction, if they have neither capacity nor wish to do so, but is it not almost as bad to 'limit' earnest teachers to so-called secular instruction! Zeal will do much, but the fact remains that whereas in the schools I myself know, no one but a fully trained teacher is allowed to deal with the religious teaching, in the Sunday school that most important of all subjects must frequently be undertaken by a teacher to whom we would not entrust the teaching of arithmetic.

The teacher who can keep a class in order is not neecssarily a good teacher; his idea of discipline may be only that of fear. But order and attention are necessary before any real teaching can be done. So far discipline must, as some one has put it, clear the decks for action. If the teacher cannot even win respect, how can he or she inculcate reverence?

The sense of community with the mother is soon enlarged to the whole family, and this widens to schoolfellows and friends. In day schools *this* kind of class feeling is largely fostered—each individual tries to uphold the honour of the class, and perhaps this might be more used in the Sunday school. For out of this community sense comes the desire for approbation. We all have an instinctive desire to be approved by those around us. Community life is so necessary to the race, that any feeling of being *out* of the community gives pain. Children cannot bear to be 'out of favour,' out of the circle—disregarded. Professor Sully tells a pathetic story of a little boy who said, 'If I could say to God just whatever I liked I would say,"Love me when I'm naughty."'

Class-feeling can only be used effectively if the teacher is on right terms with her class. I can remember when I was the second naughtiest child in the day school and a model of propriety in the Sunday school. The two effects proceeded from one cause. The tone of that day school was bad—the children were leagued against the authorities—sympathy did not exist, and the child who had courage to defy the authorities was regarded with admiration by her fellows. In the Sunday school the tone was different; my father was superintendent, and I played to another audience. Though my outward behaviour was quite different the motives, or rather I should say the impulse, was the same, that impulse being to stand well in the eyes of my fellows.

Froebel says that it is this feeling of community or social instinct which makes church-going attractive to children, when they are too young to realise much of what goes on.

Sometimes I have wondered whether a well-conducted children's service might not prove more profitable than the Sunday school. Children of respectable parents ought to go with their parents. It is much

more likely to be a reverent service if the children are among adults, than if they are taken to church in school classes. The children should feel that if they cannot behave properly they are regarded as too childish to go—that it is a privilege of the self-controlled.

At the same time we must see that the effort is not made too hard. Because Nature urges children to act, I believe that a children's service should give the children most to do, instead of letting them say responses that may become mechanical, as is done in your children's service book. I should let the children repeat such words as ' Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind and with all thy strength.' Perhaps the children might be divided into two bands—*not* into boys and girls—and say verse and response on alternate days.

Again, I think that whenever possible some parts of the service should centre round whatever is in the minds of the children. I should bring in Trafalgar Day and Harvest Thanksgiving and Easter or the coming of Spring, and Midsummer Day with its length of sunlight.

And it is also out of this germ that we call the sense of community, with its accompanying sense of dependence, of looking up with admiration, respect, and reverence, that we derive the child's attitude towards the ideal.

Every one who has *thought* of education knows what a wealth of meaning lies in that word ' ideal.' There can be no greater condemnation for societies or for individuals than to say of them ' Their ideal is a low one.' It is the possession of some kind of ideal that lifts us above the beasts that perish. For we have instincts and appetites even as they have, and alas! oftentimes both individuals and communities are ruled by them. But we *can* image to ourselves what we desire to be,—whether it is the successful teacher, preacher, or merchant—whether it is an honest man or woman—whether it is the ascetic living apart or the saint who serves and uplifts humanity—there is always something we *want* to be. Emerson says we are so sure of having what we want that we must take care only to want high things. Just as all the ideas of a little child tend to issue in action, so do our cherished ideas or ideals, for an ideal is only an idea which causes action. This is why the poet Lowell says ' Not failure, but low aim is crime.'

There is nothing to which the stages in development apply more than to the ideal up to which we live. The presentation and development of ideals is certainly part of the work of the Sunday school, though no one can ever take that away from the teacher in a day school. Very largely this ideal comes to us out of the literature we read, and to the children from the stories we tell. No matter what one's religious opinions may be, every one is agreed that this ever-developing ideal is seen more clearly in the Bible than in any other literature. It is a fund of stories in which children delight.

Have you ever considered why a child has such a craving for stories—there is hardly ever a child who does not love them, and the exceptions are easily explained. Froebel gave a better answer to that question than I have seen anywhere else. He said that this craving for stories was part of the Instinct of Investigation, the instinct which drives a child to examine his surroundings that he may adapt himself to them. In stories children study their social surroundings, they study human beings, their actions good and bad, the motives for these actions and their results. And so, by the exercise of what we call their moral judgment, they approve or disapprove, and what they approve they tend to imitate.

We teachers have two things to do here. We have to choose stories good in themselves and suited to the needs of our children, to their age and their interests, and suited to the present stage of humanity. It takes some experience to know which stories are suited to different ages. A little child has not the same standard as an adult, but it is necessary to remember that he is adapting himself all the time to the standard of those about him. There are certain people just now who suggest that such material as Grimm's fairy tales may be the right ethical material for children under six. They surely forget, what Froebel never forgot, that the child is the child of the present as well as of the past, and that brought up in civilised, Christianised surroundings, he can use his own experience as well as that of the race. Such suggestions usually come from those who

have had no personal experience with children. One author suggests that by using Chinese and Japanese stories the children will be convinced that human nature is the same all the world over, ' and so awaken sympathy.' But children neither gain such general conceptions, nor does it occur to them that human beings differ. The same author analyses various qualities displayed in fairy tales, but the relation of mother and child is one he never mentions. Another writer of ' ethical ' stories makes the opinion of the fairies of more consequence than the mother's opinion and wishes. I have seen this very book highly recommended by some of the authorities of the Moral Instruction League who would give to the same children *direct* lessons on ' gratitude ' to parents and teachers. There is much in the book that is good, but there are several things I should like to change, particularly the idea that goodness is rewarded by presents either from fairies or from others.

These things fall among the ' half truths ' which Froebel condemned. Instead of telling them that ' the good will be happy,' he says we should do well to put before the young ' the truth that whoever truly and earnestly, in singleness of purpose and self-sacrifice, seeks the good must needs expose himself to a life of external oppression, pain and want, anxiety and care.' Shew this, he says, to the child in nature, where every phase of development, however beautiful and proper in its place, must perish when a higher phase is to appear. The sheltering bud-scales must fall when the young branch or the fragrant blossom is to unfold—the fragrant blossom must make room for a fruit at first sour, hard, and homely. So taught, the human being will not murmur when he sees the wicked flourish, but will rather say to himself, ' Just because you seek only the lust, all transient and merely relative good must vanish to make room for more perfect developments, for more abiding fruit. It argues a low degree of insight into the dignity of man if the incentive of reward is needed to ensure a conduct worthy of his nation. We ought to lift and strengthen human nature, but we degrade and weaken it when we seek to lead it to good conduct by means of a bait, even if this bait beckons to a future world. Let the child become conscious of the course of his own spiritual development. The consciousness of having lived worthily should be his highest reward.'

Do not think that Froebel wrote these words as a mere theorist. He was a practical teacher. And do not think they are beyond *your* children until you have tried.

Do you remember R. L. Stevenson's verses called ' A Good Boy ' ? They are, like all his children's verses, the outcome of his vivid recollection of real childish feelings. When he sent the MS. home first his friend Colvin begged him to leave this poem out, but Stevenson refused. I am glad he did not, for they express the consciousness of having lived worthily, in terms of a child of five or six :—

' I woke before the morning, I was happy all the day,
I never said an ugly word, but smiled and stuck to play.

And now at last the sun is going down behind the wood,
And I am very happy, for I know that I've been good.

My bed is waiting cool and fresh, with linen smooth and fair,
And I must off to sleepsin-by, and not forget my prayer.

I know that, till to-morrow I shall see the sun arise,
No ugly dream shall fright my mind, no ugly sight my eyes.

But slumber hold me tightly till I waken in the dawn,
And hear the thrushes singing in the lilacs round the lawn.

.

' The consciousness of having lived worthily.' Worthy of what ? What is the heritage that we are to bring before our children ? It is the story of humanity, the story of the world's heroes and martyrs, who knew that death is but an incident, that right and wrong are the only realities.

Froebel would put great emphasis on that word consciousness, or at least on self-consciousness. He would have every child helped to realise ' his high destiny.' Froebel would have the child taught the divinity of humanity, and like Sir Oliver Lodge in his catechism for parents and teachers, he would also have the child shewn what he owes to those who have gone before him.

' Children should be grateful to those

unknown pioneers of the human race, to whose struggles and suffering and discoveries and energies our present favoured mode of existence on the planet is due.

'The more people realise the effort that has preceded them and made them possible, the more are they likely to endeavour to be worthy of it.'

The two sides of religious education that Froebel would emphasise are I think these two—the feeling of community and the feeling of self-consciousness.

Certainly religious feeling when aroused should have expression. But the only expression of which Froebel himself makes mention is that of language. He says that children ought to have words given them which will express their feelings, only he warns us that the feeling must exist before the words are given. Children are to have prayers and hymns and verses, *not too many*! and as beautiful in themselves as is possible—worth remembering for themselves.

Do you know the little paper called 'The Syrian Guest'? Read it, and then teach the children the twenty-third Psalm.

If you speak of truth, instead of teaching them that 'Lying lips are an abomination unto the Lord'—true though that is—teach them rather Psalm xxiv, 'Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord, and who shall stand in his holy place. He that hath clean hands and a pure heart: who hath not lifted up his soul to vanity, nor sworn deceitfully.'

A child has an instinct for rhythm and beauty of language. Feed it with something real. Never mind if he understands every word or every phrase, but see that he has the idea. No one who teaches children to say 'Blind unbelief is sure to err and scan his works in vain' need be surprised that unbelief was supposed to be the name of a blind man.

I do not know that I have given much help to those teachers who want actual guidance in teaching their children, so after having said that I personally do not like the expression work by clay modelling and in sand tray, I would recommend to their notice a book which uses it freely. But when anyone of intelligence uses a book, he uses what part of it seems to him best. The book is 'The Sunday Kindergarten,' by Miss Hetty Lee.

I should not use it myself, nor should I tell students in training to use it, because it gives ready-made lessons. But for those who really want guidance I believe it will be *very* helpful. It is the second of Miss Lee's books, the other being called 'New Methods in the Junior School.' It by no means limits itself to the Bible, but is based on that of course, as it is published by the National Society.

I have not the least doubt in my own mind that the Bible is the special means for the religious education of our children, but not the only means. Quite apart from any theories of special inspiration, in which I have no faith, the material is the literature of a people who were specially moral and religious—who had a special faith in Righteousness. Though other things help, nothing ever replaces the Bible. Its influence in the past cannot be calculated, and now that we look upon it in a different and more enlightened manner, I believe it will have a still deeper and higher influence in the future.

OUR SUNDAY SCHOOL MAGAZINE

Small Heath, Birmingham

GEORGE KING

With the coming of summer many changes take place in the work of the Sunday school. Young folk who have gladly met together during the dark wintry nights feel a natural impulse to get away from all association with indoor occupations, and breathe freely the fresh country air. Now is it that cricket clubs, rambling, picnicking and cycling parties are first and foremost in their thoughts. What does it all mean? It means this—that the school is split up, is divided, has lost its unity. It is true that all this is as it should be, but it is none the less true that some society is needed which shall form, as it were, a connecting link between the various sections of the school. Such a link we have at Waverley Road, in the School Magazine. It is no elaborately printed, gorgeously illustrated, periodical; no magazine which comes to us once a month, ready-made, requiring only a picture of the church on the front page and a calendar on the back. No; our magazine is the work of the girls and boys of the school: a manuscript magazine, whose editor is

free from the worries of the printer, whose treasurer has no financial difficulties to encounter. So much for the magazine itself. To the outside world it appears upon specially designed, detachable notice-boards, arranged along one side of the room in which the whole school and the church societies are wont to meet. It is issued on the first Sunday of each month, and is interesting from cover to cover, or rather from beginning to end.

Now let us take a peep behind the scenes, for it is here that the Waverley Road Magazine does most of its work. A general editor, appointed with the sanction of the teachers' committee, is responsible for its production. He is also chairman of what might be called the Editorial Board. This Board consists of girls and boys of the first two classes, whose ages vary from thirteen to seventeen—the most critical period of the scholar's life. The child is then emerging from the narrow bounds of a dependent self-life ;—it is the emotional period. It is, with boys, the time for slang, because no words in any dictionary can possibly express all that crowds to utterance ; it is the prime period of enthusiasm, of physical and intellectual activity, of hero-worship.

The name by which the Board shall be known is of vast importance. 'Editorial Board ' is far too crude. Now King Arthur has always been a popular hero with boys, and the story of the Round Table and the Twelve Knights is well known. So we at Small Heath have pressed the story of this old-world great man into our service. We are the R.T.C., the Round Table Conference. The twelve members are seated around the table, the general editor presiding. His Merlin is the sub-editor, elected from the general body. No less important are the sub-editress, the secretary, and the treasurer—positions to which all members aspire. Such is the constitution of the R.T.C. Members bring to the conferences their contributions for the month—reports of school cricket matches, concerts, and what not ; and it may be noted in passing that the magazine has pages devoted to science gossip and humorous selections. The proceedings of the conference are spiced with true formality. The general editor calls upon the secretary to read the minutes of the last meeting, which are duly signed. Members are then called upon, in definite order from the editor downwards, to read their contributions. The suitability of the subject and its treatment by the author are discussed by the other members, and when opinion differs the matter is voted upon. Much care has to be exercised by the general editor ; for his power, which should be supreme, must not be directly felt. He must keep himself familiar with the lines :—

> All views with tolerance observed,
> And thine with courtesy expressed.
> Thus hath discussion best subserved
> Truth's high and holy interest.

All accepted articles are forthwith handed to the editor, and the order in which they are to be arranged upon the notice-board is determined.

Our Magazine is essentially a school magazine, and as such receives articles from external contributors—girls and boys who are not members of the R.T.C. Their presence at the meetings is requested, but they have no power to vote. It is from these external contributors that future members of the R.T.C. are drawn.

The rules—and the first thing such conferences should do is to make rules—state that new members shall be elected from constant external contributors who observe the following conditions :—

(1) The contributions must have been of sufficient merit.

(2) The candidate must have the welfare of the school at heart, and must be held in high esteem by teachers and scholars.

The vote of members for or against the candidate is here, as in all other cases, registered secretly, and the new member is initiated with much ceremony. Apart from original contributions, much care is taken in the choice of suitable articles from magazines : therein lies training for the young mind. The boy who searches out true humour from all the trashy matter of modern newspaper jokes, humorous pages, and the like, will never when a man mistake vulgarity for wit. The success of such an organisation depends largely upon minor details.

The paper used is uniform in size and quality. Magazines for past months are bound together with paper fasteners. Stiff brown paper, suitably adorned, forms an admirable cover. These past numbers are

lent to church members at a small charge. In this way the R.T.C. has been placed on a firm financial basis. Special forms of voting boxes should be made: thus one in which coloured headed pins are withdrawn secretly and afterwards counted has been found to work well. The notices calling the meeting together should be formal yet novel—something fresh each time. If a solution of ordinary saltpetre in water be used instead of ink, upon rough paper (newspaper), invisible notices are made which upon the application of a glowing match trace out in true oracular fashion a fiery summons to attend the R.T.C. These things ensure attendance at the meetings and at the same time create a desire to know 'how it works.' Badges to be worn on special occasions should also be made, for by this means external contributors are attracted.

With such a selection of girls and boys as this, composed, as it will be, of the very best in the school, an enormous responsibility rests upon the leader. Well might one say that such a leader 'must necessarily have the magnetism of Moses, the patience of Job, and the wisdom of Solomon.' It is a high standard to set, but—

'. . . . He who aimeth at the sky
Shoots higher much than he who means a tree.'

Sometimes the work seems to be small in its reach and grasp. One holds but a few among so many. Yet another Teacher was content to have twelve disciples. Let us pray that we may have strength to follow his teaching and perform our duty with that earnestness which arises from a due sense of the importance of our work and our responsibility to God.

There were some among us who had come to feel that a Christian church was established not only for the edification of its own members, but for the general cause of Christianity; and that it was specially bound to extend the means of moral and religious instruction to such families or individuals in its neighbourhood, as from poverty or any other causes were deprived of the benefit of the public ordinances of religion.—*Channing.*

I give you the end of a golden string,
Only wind it into a ball,
It will lead you in at heaven's gate,
Built in Jerusalem's wall.—*Blake.*

THE DUTCH CHURCH AT AUSTIN FRIARS, LONDON

W. G. TARRANT, B.A.

An American cousin—more strictly a Canadian brother—has recently inquired in the *Christian Register* (Boston) whether travellers to the Berlin Congress are likely to find guidance to certain sites important in the history of Unitarianism. For example, he refers to Venice, Naples, and London, but I am afraid most of us will have little chance of seeing any of these except the last; so I will leave Venice and Naples to other hands. But what follows may be of interest and use to a good many people, especially this year, when London Unitarians are invited to assemble for a special service (next October) in the Dutch Church at Austin Friars.

Where is it? What is there remarkable about it? Why should an American Unitarian look all across the Atlantic towards it, and wonder if it still 'remains'? Let us see.

First we begin with the name 'Austin Friars.' That takes us back six and a half centuries. Just before the barons and squires of England managed to get a Parliament established, there came certain 'friars eremites,' of different orders, who settled in places dotted about London—as well as in the country—and we know the places, though the places know the friars no more. There are, for instance, Blackfriars, Whitefriars, and Austin Friars. To be exact, these 'Augustine Friars,' as they should be called, founded their monastery in old London city in 1253. They were distinguished as a *scholarly* set, or meant to be; and at any rate they seem to have been respectable. Some one (Humphrey, Earl of Hereford) left them a large sum of money in 1344, and his grandson in 1354 built therewith a goodly church for the monastery's work among the people.

It was a fine building, rising above the houses of the citizens, and dwarfing the lowly home of the friars themselves. When it was finished the good brothers working in the spacious gardens of the monastery would look up now and again at the tall white walls and traceried windows, and the whole edifice topped with a lofty and graceful spire over the chancel. When Chaucer was a young fellow with an eye for the

picturesque and an ear for the romantic, he would stroll up from the Vintner's Wharf at Dowgate, where his father's business lay; and as he went north from the river towards the wall where 'moor and fen' were shut out—(now recorded by the names Moorgate and Finsbury)—he saw that fine new church and the monks in their scholarly black-and-white raiment. And it is something for us to see at least part of what Chaucer did.

The map of London has altered again and again, but here, as of old, stands the actual original Church of the Austin Friars. Where? Pass along the front of the Bank of England, curve round Old Broad Street a little way, and then on your left hand you will see a little thoroughfare named 'Austin Friars.' Go down it a yard or two, and then on your right you will see a stone-paved passage between offices, and a church porch beyond. That is our shrine—a true 'holy place.' Before you go in, follow the route of 'Austin Friars' to its end in Throgmorton Avenue, and thus you will pass the noble west end of this famous building. Mark well its width, its arches, its turret on the north angle; look along the north face to where the transept stood; then come back with me to the south entrance, and listen.

King Henry VIII, for reasons of his own, decided to close all monasteries in his kingdom. In 1534 the Augustine brethren here surrendered. There were but thirteen of them; but had there been fourteen I fear their luck would have been the same. They were not wealthy—the revenue was reported at £57 os. 4d. Their poverty availed no more than their piety. They were dispersed finally in 1548. Their lands and buildings were divided among three favoured persons, one being Sir William Paulett, Lord Treasurer to Edward VI, and afterwards Marquis of Winchester. This nobleman built his residence on part of his share; hence 'Great Winchester Street' hard by, and the modern 'Winchester House,' a typical commercial centre in our day.

It appears that the fine church, at that date barely 200 years old, began at once to suffer and decay. The nave alone escaped ruin; and this was used as a store for goods—hay, wood, anything. Yet the famous dead within those walls might have pleaded against such base uses. Not only was pious Humphrey Bohun, the founder, buried there, but after the Battle of Barnet, many a slain baron found there his last peace; and the beheaded Duke of Buckingham, whose fall is pictured by Shakespeare in 'King Henry VIII,' was buried there in 1521. What the pathetic memory of the dead failed to secure, was secured by the practical needs of the living.

King Henry having died in 1547, Edward VI reigned in his stead. Those were stirring times. Already, since 1520, thousands of refugees from the Netherlands and Germany had sought a 'Protestant liberty' (as it was afterwards called) in England. As the years went on and persecution became more bitter, their numbers increased. And by special invitation of Edward's ecclesiastical advisers, Cranmer and the rest, many of the leading continental Reformers came to London, to confer about a possible union of all the reformed churches. Among these distinguished men was *John à Lasco*, a Polish nobleman and professor of divinity. Others, known to students of Unitarian history, were Peter Martyr and Bernardino Ochino—the latter being very distinctly a forerunner of our faith.[1]

But we must keep in mind the great bulk of the immigrants, some rich, some poor; merchants, manufacturers, traders in all sorts of ware. There were hundreds, nay, thousands of them in our country. Their presence was not wholly welcomed by native workers—they were more than usually diligent, and decidedly expert in skilled industries. Ever since Edward III began to introduce foreign workmen complaints had arisen, and even riots occurred, from time to time. Chaucer may have seen a large number of poor 'Flemings' executed at the time of the Wat Tyler rebellion, in 1381; some of them were taken from this very church of Austin Friars. But now, in 1550, the Church which these hapless ancients attended as guests, was given to the 'Strangers' to be their own place of worship.

Yes; John à Lasco, the Pole, was instructed to draw up a code of articles of faith, and to act as superintendent over

[1] For details see the invaluable book by Professor G. Bonet-Maury—'Early Sources of English Unitarianism.'

the new congregation. Edward VI had been persuaded by 'an enquiring and godly woman,'—the Duchess of Suffolk—to allow this privilege to the 'Strangers'; and the very parchment (signed by his secretary), though it went into exile with a great company of the Dutch when Queen Mary banished them, came safely back, and may be seen there in the archives to-day.

The burnings under Queen Mary soon ended. The exiles returned—but not quite to the same liberty as before. Elizabeth required that the 'Strangers' should not be exempt from the law of the Established Church of which she was Head; and henceforward, from 1560, their congregation was superintended by the Bishop of London. Nevertheless they went on by themselves—the Dutch remaining at Austin Friars, the French and Spanish contingents going elsewhere. And somehow the Unitarianising elements clung to the place. Their minister from 1559 to 1562 was Adrian Hämstede; he protested that his own opinions were quite orthodox, but he maintained that certain 'Anabaptists' who were unsound on the doctrine of the incarnation were not therefore to be excluded from the true church. This was held to be dangerous latitude, and the Bishop removed him, besides dismissing from England a much more dangerous heretic and lover of religious freedom, by name *Acontius* (Giacomo Contio), to whose writings a certain brave poet and heretic of the next century owed much. *His* name was John Milton.

So it is for very special reasons that we Unitarians walk with reverent minds the spacious area of this famous building. It is but the nave (as I have said) of the old monastery church; you can see where the chancel was walled up, with the heraldic lions of the House of Orange loyally displayed in red and gold on the wall above the communion table. The chancel was utterly broken down; in 1609 its noble spire, one of the glories of old London, was allowed by the once lavish and now parsimonious fourth Lord Winchester to tumble in ruin. The mayor and citizens had besought him to spend £50 on it and save so beautiful a thing. In vain; rather when it collapsed he got what he could for the broken materials. On the site of the chancel a house was built, which was replaced in 1872 by the offices you now see abutting on Old Broad Street. The same nobleman, not very noble (notwithstanding all his expensive entertainment of Queen Elizabeth), further got his £600 from the congregation or the 'Kerchof' and houses adjoining. I think the Church felt itself lucky to be quit of him at any price.

That last transaction took place in 1611, which you will (doubtless) remember was the year when the 'Authorised Version' of the Bible was issued by command of 'his most sacred Majesty, King James I.' You may also remember that at that very time Mr. William Shakespeare, described in a recently discovered legal document of the following year as 'gentleman, of Stratford-upon-Avon,' but known to us as a writer of plays, was lodging a little north of Cheapside, and near to the Church of the French immigrants, with one of these same Frenchmen, an ingenious worker in head attire. I would rather talk of the poet just now than the King, but he has left me no trace of his reflections on the Dutch congregation of Austin Friars. The King has; for in most exorbitant, but not wholly unusual fashion, he 'squeezed' vast sums of money out of the worthy merchants who used to assemble there.

But, indeed, this 'gossipping guide' must stop, or you will never get round the Church and out again! He must forbear, then, to tell you of the splendid triumphal arches those canny Dutchmen put up on festal occasions in London town,—one for James himself (but that was before he robbed them), and one for Charles I and his Queen. Nor can you stay to be told how one clever member of the Dutch community, having made an 'artificiall forcier,' conveyed water from the Thames—then a river where a silvery-coated salmon might live, till hooked—and poured it through leaden pipes at a standard at the 'four-ways' east of Cornhill. Nor how another, Vermuyden by name, became famous as a drainer of fens, and the repairer of Dagenham Breach—I wonder if you know your lower Thames? Nor how the poor 'Strangers,' whose ancestors suffered the fires of martyrdom in sadly too many cases, were accused of wilfully causing the Great Fire of 1666. As to this last event, let us be thankful that it spared the old Church of Austin Friars;—not so, however, a fire in 1862, which burnt it out

completely, roof and all, but left the walls and pillars, slightly out of perpendicular as you see, and a little of the old glass of the sixteenth century. You can see the 'I.H.S.' on some of the diamond panes, and the legend (in Dutch) showing that this is the veritable 'Jesus Tempel' of history. You can see also some of the storied and heraldic grave-stones, many of the eighteenth century, some later,—showing a goodly line of civic life. The congregation, which meets now in an oaken panelled inner square, is but a tiny representative of the crowds that formerly met here; but it is an honest fellowship—and as frankly Unitarian as can be. If you doubt me ask the minister, the Rev. S. Baart de la Faille. The new roof covers the same old hallowed spot. The notable breadth of the span—hardly equalled by any cathedral in the country—shall be typical to me of the broadly inclusive spirit of our great and noble faith.

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHER AS WORLD-MAKER[1]

J. MORLEY MILLS

THE great Prophet of Nazareth, who loved the children, spoke of the work of a teacher as the sowing of the good-seed in the field, which is the world.

Such a conception was new in those days, and soon lost sight of. We are, however, better able to grasp it. Scientific inventions are linking together the uttermost parts of the earth. Hundreds of 'floating cities' and other means of travel are bringing into closer connection every country in the world. As some writer puts it, 'We have seen the death of distance.' Therefore, in this age, the continents, with the isles of the sea, form the chess-board on which not mere empire-builders but world-makers are expending their skill. To-day, literally, the field of political operations is the world, and many are they who are ambitious to be world-makers.

To this end every great discovery is eagerly seized upon and worked for what it may be worth as a means of increasing the supremacy of a dominant party. And our age is one of epoch-making discoveries. But by far the most momentous of these is THE DISCOVERY OF THE CHILD!

To primitive man it would appear that the child was an 'encumbrance.' This term, as a relic of prehistoric barbarism, is yet found in a certain class of advertisement to be seen occasionally in our papers

As man became religious the child came to have a value as a means of placating a supposed angry deity. He offered up as a sacrifice the child, that its innocence might be acceptable as a substitute for his own purity of life.

As man became a warrior and united with others to form a warrior tribe, the male child had a value as a prospective fighter.

Early civilisations were based on slavery, and the child had, then, a value in the market as a slave.

In an industrial age the child has worth as a cheap labourer. Parents of this period look on their children from the standpoint of early wage-earners.

To a nation aspiring to be a 'world-power' the child becomes necessary for schemes of world domination. To this end the State puts forward a claim to the child: insists on his being fed, mentally trained, and physically drilled, that he may be made an effective political unit.

We see down the centuries a growing significance of the child, but the significance has lain in his value as a sacrifice. Superstition sacrificed him to the Past; Commercialism sacrificed him to the Present; World-politics sacrifices him to the Future. To all, the child is an instrument of power to be fitted into man-made grooves for the increase of material might.

But we are beginning to discern in the child a greater meaning. We are coming to perceive that the child IS A LIVING SOUL!—aye, a living soul, not a power-serving mechanism; an evolving Entity, not a cog in a revolving wheel.

The child is a living soul of divine origin, with ITS OWN divinely appointed part to perform in that infinite scheme of things which is making for the 'one far-off divine event to which the whole creation moves.' We are getting a glimpse of the child as a potent factor in the growth of the world that is to be!

With this stupendous discovery there

[1] Spoken at the Annual Meeting of the Manchester District Sunday School Association, 1910.

comes a second view, namely: The child is no longer to be sacrificed to any merely mundane purpose. The child is to be emancipated with what skill in us lies, from the swaddling clothes of our superstitions, fads, or power-gaining plans, that it may the more perfectly work out the divine plan for which, by the Creator, it is endowed and designed.

A child is a marvellous magazine of spiritual energies. That most wonderful, subtle, unanalysable something about the child, and proceeding from it, is what we call *influence.* We have thought of the child as a fluid, or flexible being, without positive influence of its own. But what a mistake! A little helpless baby comes into a home, and what a difference! Such is the influence exerted by that seemingly impotent little thing, that though it shall have lived but a day it will have left on the hearts of father and mother an effect that not all the years following shall succeed in obliterating.

The child is daily influencing father and mother deeply and permanently; is influencing brothers and sisters, playmates, school companions, workfellows, members of club, or church, or community in which work is done and life is lived. As the founder of another home and the parent of other children, the power for influencing increases in ever-widening circles. Passing through the veil of death, the spirit enters on another stage where influence is exerted. Wider and yet wider extend the bounds of influence proceeding from the once apparently negligible infant, till they spread out to infinity. Verily, the coming of a child into our midst is the greatest thing known to us in the universe. Of a truth, the kingdom cometh by the children. The world to be is to evolve from the children that are!

Now, the question forcing itself upon us is,—WHAT SORT OF WORLD shall it be? And the reply comes: That will depend, not so much on what the child is *made to do,* as on what WE INSPIRE THE CHILD TO BE!

The educationist is bent on developing the intellect, i.e., on improving and sharpening the tool. The militarist is concerned about the production of a disciplined fighter. The politician aims at growing a responsive voter. Each of these is engaged on an important work.

But what if young people should be left with low motives, mean purposes, ignoble ideals, dwarfed moral judgment, oblique spiritual vision? What can a monarch do with *such* a nation? What can any statesman make of *such* a democracy? In spite of the best intellectual education, the most likely of economic changes, *such* a community would, by the ignoble use of enhanced means, but run a nation up into an evolutionary *cul de sac.* There could be no permanent human advance on those lines. We are brought face to face with the greatest need of the times—the need for touching to right action in the children and youth of a People those subtle springs of energy which are to govern the *morale* of all merely commercial plans and civic organisations. That is to say, only with a People of magnificent ideals, and splendid moral motive power, is progress possible and assured!

Now, among all the so-called child-improving institutions in modern civilisation, which stands specifically for touching to high motives a soul, that it shall use the improved means at its disposal for great purposes and noble ends? The only one so standing is THE SUNDAY SCHOOL!

Who among men and women in our advanced age stands out specifically for giving to the child lofty ideals, pure motives, inspiring conceptions, greatening visions? THE SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHER! No other institution, no other worker in civilisation, stand so precisely for just this as the Sunday school and the Sunday school teacher.

The Sunday school teacher is in at the beginning of the eternal evolution of a human soul, to give to it its first impressions of human life; to touch to right action the subtle and delicate springs of being; to communicate unto it a glowing enthusiasm for the divine! This is the peculiar, the momentous mission of the Sunday school teacher. Of all the workers in the world-field he is the greatest. Others are world-exploiters or world-users, or world-directors; we, as Sunday school teachers, are world-makers.

The educationist must give a better tool to the one whom we have inspired to be the better man; the statesman must legislate for the citizen to whom we have communicated a higher sense of civic

responsibility; the world-ruler must co-ordinate the communities composed of those who are striving to realise that lofty ideal of the brotherhood of divine sons, which the disciple of Jesus has put into the heart of a new generation.

Does the magnificence, the grandeur, the greatness, the responsibility of the place and work of the Sunday school teacher appal? Does it make you feel so unfitted for the task as to cause you to shrink from ever attempting it again? Certainly such a view of our work humbles. But, surely, it also inspires and fills with enthusiasm. Why do so many give up teaching in our Sunday schools? Is it because they have too high views of their task? Nay; rather, is it that low views of the work are responsible for low numbers and low average of efficiency among us as teachers. The teacher with a Christ-conception of the work of blessing the little children dare not give up his task, would not if he could, and is thereby impelled to increasing earnestness and efficiency.

As Sunday school teachers let us get the Christ-perception of the little ones—an angel in every child! Let us realise that we are dealing with souls made to be centres of spiritual influence throughout the eternities; let us know that the forces that are moral and spiritual are to be the world-making energies now and always; let us ourselves in secret and on our knees get close to the Father- and Mother-heart of this vast universe, that we may become overflowingly charged with the streams of love-power, that shall reach out to every child in the class. Then a holy joy will fill our hearts, and to our spirits shall be granted the prophetic vision of the time when, in consequence of our patient and effective sowing in the world-field, 'the righteous shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.'

There is no one so miscreated or misplaced as to have within him no germs of good, from which a fruitful circle may be made to spread. Just as in the Pacific Ocean, if once a coral rock is built up to the level of the tide and feels the caresses of the wind, some little speck of life appears, and as the island rises, widens till it dips into the salt waves; so in the most desolate mind, born furthest from the mainland of hope and power, there is never wanting some point of native green that may creep, as it were, from stone to stone, till it fairly drive the barrenness away.—*Martineau.*

MR. F. J. GOULD'S LESSON-DEMONSTRATIONS

J. E. H.

Ours is an orthodox Sunday school. At any rate, it would probably be considered orthodox by the readers of the Sunday School Quarterly. But *they* belong to the extreme Left, and there are others, of the Right, who look upon us as very heterodox indeed. It was therefore with the feeling of greatly daring that we invited Mr. F. J. Gould to give us a couple of lesson-demonstrations. Mr. Gould is now the accredited agent of the Moral Instruction League, with his headquarters in London, so there were no difficulties in the way except one of our own making. The teaching in our school is still almost entirely on a Bible basis. Mr. Gould in his recent public work has avoided the Bible, not because the material it contains is unsuitable to his method of teaching, but because there are controversial difficulties as to the proper use of the Bible, which he prefers not to raise, and because he is anxious to preserve his right of entry into all the sects.

When we asked him to break with his usual custom and give us a couple of Bible lessons, he hesitated. 'What about your people?' he inquired. 'Will they stand it?' We assured him that our 'people' would not only stand it, but that they would positively enjoy listening to a man whose point of view differed from their own. So the difficulties were removed and the demonstrations arranged.

We provided a mixed class of twenty boys and girls, and these were seated in a semi-circle of chairs, in the middle of the room. Around but *behind* them (Mr. Gould insists on this to prevent the children's interest being distracted) was the audience, which included many Sunday school teachers from other schools, and some day-school teachers and other educational experts. One and all were delighted with Mr. Gould's methods.

Starting quietly, he caught the interest of the class at once by a simple story, the bearing of which on the lesson was not immediately apparent. He made considerable use of questioning, particularly in recapitulation of the points of his stories, with a view to discovering whether they had reached home.

At the first demonstration three incidents in the life of Moses were used as the framework of the lesson, which could be summed up as 'All service is good, provided it is heart-service.'

The demonstration on the second evening provided Mr. Gould with a more difficult subject. The main incident was taken from the New Testament, and concerned the visit of Jesus to the Syro-Phœnician woman. The thought behind the lesson was a difficult one for children to grasp. It was contained in the words 'We are everyone members one of another,' a sentence which was impressively repeated by the whole class at the close. In the course of this lesson Mr. Gould made effective use of the story of Bkikhibai, published, in another connection, in the last issue of the QUARTERLY.

So we surmounted both Mr. Gould's difficulties and our own, and having done so can heartily recommend his lesson-demonstrations to those who desire to make their teaching more effective. But whether he is satisfied with the experiment and would be willing to repeat it, we do not know.

A boy was told one day to go do his lessons. He wanted to be snowballing. As he heard the order he somehow lost all thought of his mother who was speaking, and the fire in the grate, and the room, and found himself looking at a battle. One party on horseback, gaily dressed, and carrying many coloured banners, came on with song and shout. The other was on foot about a castle. In that castle, in a room, he saw himself; he had books, but he seemed restless and discontented, looking out of the window. But all the time he was looking on, at the armies and at himself. Then the fighting began, and he looked first to one side then to the other; wished first one and then the other might win. After a while he began to wish very much that the gay soldiers on horseback might, and he shouted and cheered, and soon the army on foot was flying, and the gay soldiers had broken open the castle door, and pulled him out and set him on a horse, and were flying away. Where—? He came to himself; and his mother had gone, and he was just opening the door to go snowballing.

If men had been educated and controlled for thousands of years in the way that women have been, there is every reason for believing they would not have reached higher results in literature, art, and science. History proves very clearly that subject races of men have not advanced mentally and morally, and that they have developed the meaner qualities of human nature in undue proportion.—*George Willis Cooke.*

THE ARCHIBALD METHOD

Some Introductory Remarks Thereon

BERTRAM LISTER, M.A.

[As, when this paper was originally written, it was intended to be *read* at a meeting of the Bolton District and Bury District Sunday School Unions, and was not intended for publication, references to authorities have been omitted and quotation marks left out. I should like, therefore, to acknowledge here my indebtedness to various books, especially to those of Mr. G. H. Archibald published by the Sunday School Union, as well as to his lectures. Those familiar with the literature on the subject will easily recognise the borrowed passages.—B.L.]

IN days gone by,—and some of us do still at the present day, I am afraid,—we used to look on teaching as the simplest matter imaginable. The pupils were there in front of us; all we had to do was to let a stream of wisdom flow from our inspired lips, and if the child did not grow up to be a perfect specimen of youth, it was not our fault. 'And the child increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man' (Lu. ii. 52). That is what we used to expect to be said of all the children with whom we had anything to do. If it did not come to pass, it was not our fault, but the fault of the child. And to ensure this wonderful result, we did all that we could by never preparing our lessons, by never caring whether our lessons were interesting, by enforcing silence and order and quiet through a free use of hand and foot, and by sundry other methods too many to catalogue. (I speak from personal experience of my own earlier teaching days.) And to our sorrow we found that the words of scripture did not apply, and our labour was in vain. And rightly, too. Our labour was in vain, not so much through the density of the pupil as through the idiotic treatment of the teacher.

We treated the child as a little man. We tried to put into him our own more or less grown-up ideas. We thought he would understand what we understood. We treated him as one of ourselves, and took no trouble to find out if that was the proper treatment.

Now, however, we are gradually realising

that that won't do. A revolution must take place. The old methods have failed : new ones are necessary, and we do not want new methods just because they are new, but because by them we can make our efforts for good more effective. And the question everyone is asking is ' What are the new methods that will give us better results ? ' We are satisfied no longer with superficial knowledge of the subject ; we feel we must get to the bottom of it, if our time is to be spent to the best advantage. At last we are waking up to our sins. Repentance for our past errors is coming fairly late in the day, but luckily, for once, it is a case of better late than never.

We want to know the child : let us go to the child and find out from him. The study of child-nature is one of the most important subjects of the day. Only by observing the child himself can we hope to prepare ourselves for the work of teaching ; for teaching is not merely the pouring forth of a stream of words, no matter how full of wisdom they be, into the ears of the defenceless mortal sitting quietly in front of us, but the enabling of the taught to express in terms of his own personality the new truths which have just been discovered to him. The child must be made to think.

If a missionary went to missionise the wild tribes of Africa and took no trouble to learn any other language but his own English, and when he got there talked in English, even though he talked for a century he would not convert the poor natives who came to listen to him. They would say to themselves, ' What *is* the fool talking about ? ' and perhaps, if their sense of humour was sufficiently developed, they might put the family stewpot on and proceed to hold a feast. And no one could blame them. But they are more fortunate than the child. The native chief does not compel his tribesmen to sit and listen to the missionary's babbling for hours at a time : as soon as they have had enough they can get up and go. And they do. But not so the child. A paternal government insists that he shall spend so many hours a week at the day school on five days out of the seven, and a maternal government insists that he shall go to Sunday school twice on Sundays. The only chance he has of putting on a stewpot is by shuffling his feet and making a nuisance of himself, which he does. If he misses during the week, the Inspector is expected to—and does—go to find out why. If he misses on the Sabbath, the class teacher is expected to—and does not —go to find out why. I sometimes wonder if the Sunday school teacher fails in this part of his duty because he is ashamed of the lesson he has been giving. No one can blame the poor little piece of humanity for wriggling about on the hard forms, for playing with his handkerchief, for trying to perpetrate jokes on his neighbours, in short, for looking and being unutterably bored by the whole proceedings. The more I wonder the less I understand, what good some of our classes did, and why the children went to school at all, unless it was to give their mothers a half-holiday. I am not, of course, referring to our own schools at the present time. My illustrations are taken from the state of affairs in my own class when I used to teach,—I thought at the time it was teaching,—with more or less regularity. Of the methods in vogue to-day I have little knowledge, and so I would not presume to judge. I am told that this is no longer the state of the case. And I am delighted to hear it, for unless the Sunday school is to be merely a crèche, that style of thing will not do. Of course, it is just possible that such a state of things does exist in some of the uncivilised districts of England even to-day but I can scarcely believe it. No ; what I have said is meant to show that some improvement on the then existing methods was wanted,—I am not having veiled shots at any of our own teachers or schools ; but I am trying to show that what we want is a systematic study of the child himself. If we are to do any good, we are not to go to him as the missionary went to the savages, but we must take him something he can understand.

Let us confine ourselves more or less to Sunday schools. It is no use the teacher going to his class unless he is prepared properly to meet the child on his own level ; —not that the level of the child is lower than that of the adult : it is of a different standard, and the teacher must transform himself to the standard of the child. For instance, it is no use trying to explain an unknown word by words equally unknown. There is a story of a teacher who was trying to tell the class the meaning of the

word 'Epiphany.' 'This is Epiphany Sunday, girls,' she said, 'and Epiphany means Manifestation.' When one of the children reached home that day, her mother asked what the subject of the lesson had been, and was told. Then she said, 'And what does the word Epiphany mean, dear?' 'Epiphany means "Man at the station,"' was the startling reply. It took the mother an hour and a half to discover the connection between the church festival and the gentleman at the railway station.

That is an example of how not to teach.

The child's outlook on life and the teacher's are different; but the child's is large enough for the teacher to draw upon, and the lessons should always start from the point of contact of the subject with the child's experience. The same applies to the older classes as well. For instance, if you want to read to a class of boys, average age seventeen, the 'Passing of the Third Floor Back,' the best way to get inattention is to start somewhat after this style: 'Now, boys, silence please. For the lesson this afternoon, we are going to read in turns this book. The story is a goody-goody one, and there is an excellent moral to it. You must all listen, and I shall ask you questions on it afterwards. The moral is so-and-so: notice it as you go along. Now, are you all ready and listening?' What do you think would be the effect of that? On nine out of ten faces there would come a look of martyrdom and boredom, and it would serve the teacher right if they shuffled their feet for the rest of the afternoon. But if you begin something like this: 'Good afternoon, boys. Which of you went to the theatre last week? What was the play? How did you like it? Was the acting good?' and lead up from the theatre to the book, then you would get immediate attention. The theatre is something in which they are all interested. Time your reading so that you get to the last page just as the bell goes, and then as you finish ask if any of them would like to read the story for themselves at home, and the nine who would otherwise have considered themselves martyrs will now ask for the book,—the tenth will have it already and will offer to pass it round.

You must start with something the scholars are interested in if you would claim and keep attention, no matter how old the scholars are.

Here I should like to say just one word on behalf of the teacher. I do not think we give him fair play. When we want new teachers, we go to some member of one of the senior classes or of the congregation, and ask him to take on a certain class, telling him that it is not at all a difficult matter, that it will not take up much time, that it is simple and easy, and so on. And this new teacher, who comes usually with no previous experience, we put face to face with a lively class of boys or girls, and leave him to find out for himself that we have falsely represented to him his work. And yet we grumble at him if he does not attain perfection. If we want to get the best out of the teacher we ought at least to give him a fair idea of his work before he begins, so that he can come a little more adequately prepared. Now the Archibald System does aim at this as one of its main ideas, and it helps the teacher to realise not only the help he is giving to the school and the religious life of the community, but also the duties and responsibilities which he has taken upon himself in becoming a teacher.

Let us turn now to the young child and examine him, and see if we cannot get some hints on how to go about our teaching in the one hour we have him with us on the Sunday afternoon. Of course, I cannot give you a lecture on Child Nature. That would take up the whole evening, and there would be no time for a discussion. But let me mention briefly one or two points that are important for us as teachers.

What I have said about starting from experience applies to the child in the youngest class just as much as it does to the man in the senior class. To the baby, home, parents, toys, are the beginning of Heaven and Earth. God is a great big edition of his father, and his father is God's second in command, able to do everything, knowing everything there is to know, and so on. To him Light comes before the Sun: the sun is there because it is day, not vice versa.

During the first six or seven years of his life he is gradually gaining the mastery of his bodily powers, and during that time he is extremely restless. He cannot sit still for more than a few minutes at a time. Therefore give him plenty to do and keep

him occupied. We may return to that in a few minutes. For the next six or seven years of his life he is strengthening his intellectual powers. Then he wants to do what others are doing. He plays follow-my-leader, and cannot bear being beaten. Then from about his thirteenth year onward the social spirit comes to the front. Instead of being anxious to make the biggest score in the match, he hopes that his side will win. He plays for The Eleven.

In the first stage, his feelings come first. They develop sooner than his intellect does: that comes later. And we must get at him through his feelings, his love for his parents. His fears and joys are real to him. How often do the elders laugh at his fears and take no notice of his joys! That surely is a great mistake. Just as the boy of fourteen will be miserable if the girl to whom he has entrusted his youthful affections does but frown on him, —and it is real misery to him while it lasts, though he may soon find someone else!— so to the child of five or six, or eight or ten, life is real and earnest, and is a serious thing, too. The worst of grown-ups is that they so soon forget what their thoughts and feelings were when they went to school. If they would only try to go back a little more, they would get on so much better with children.

These things are real to him, but Time is not. He cannot understand what is meant by a year or a century. How can he, when he has only lived for six short years? One child was once told a Bible story and then was asked how long ago he thought it happened. 'Oh, I guess it was last week,' he answered. The child lives in the present. The past and the future are more or less meaningless words to him. He imagines everything into the present, and his imagination is one of his finest possessions. If he is told a tale, he pictures it to himself. If he is shown a picture, he tells himself the tale. Therefore story-telling is one of the chief tasks of the teacher's life. This is the teacher's strongest point, for every child loves a story. Say to a child, 'Come here, and I will tell you a tale,' and the child will come and be as good as gold,—unless he is ill. So, always have a fund of stories stored away for instant use,—fairy stories, Bible stories, stories of this kind and that, always ready,—but don't draw morals. Don't we all sympathise with the child who interrupted the moralising teacher with 'Oh, never mind the moral; tell us another tale'? Children can resurrect morals for themselves, unless they are buried too deeply, and in that case the story has been badly told. Never mind the moral, but tell them another tale. It will do more good.

Then a child is always wanting to help. When there are two or three children playing about, mothers sometimes get irritable, and when a child comes and says, 'Mother, let me help,' the mother says 'Run away and play, there's a good boy; I haven't time now,' and the child runs away and plays, discouraged, and does not offer to help again when his mother is busy. That mother is sometimes heard to complain in later years that her children never think of offering to do anything, but are always thinking of enjoyment.

Another thing a child is always doing— collecting. We call it a craze, but it is a very good craze. Of course the collecting does not always take the turn we would like it to do, but in that case we should guide it in the right direction. Most children of to-day seem to begin with tram tickets and cigarette cards, and if tram tickets are dangerous, then let the mother judiciously turn the attention to something else,—stamps, crests,—there are hundreds of things that can be collected, and collecting is good for the child; therefore let him collect. Just as, having pets is good for him. Let him keep as many pets as he wishes. Rats, mice, rabbits, canaries, silkworms, dogs, cats, pigeons, doves, tadpoles,—all have a good effect on the developing mind of the youngster. He learns to attend to them;—probably he will forget to feed them occasionally, but that is only natural and cannot be helped: model boys do not exist nowadays, —they only lived when our grandfathers and uncles were small,—and, to use Mr. Archibald's words, 'tending makes one tender, and caring for things makes one careful.' Therefore give him pets to watch over, give him seeds to sow,—and don't be cross with him if he digs them up the following day to see how they are growing— and he will grow up all the better for having had something to think about other than himself.

For a child learns by indirection and suggestion. If you yawn ostentatiously in a crowded tramcar, you will find the yawn going round from one to another. If you cough in the middle of a sermon, someone else will follow suit. If you start putting on your hat before the curtain goes down on the last scene at the theatre, others will do the same, and if you leave before it is over, others will look at their watches and wonder if it is not time to be leaving if they would catch their train. And children are much the same. By suggestion they learn. Therefore take pains to teach by suggestion only what is good. Dont be everlastingly saying 'Don't' to them. Try 'Do' for a change. When Adam and Eve were in the Garden of Eden they were told not to eat of a certain tree. Immediately they went and ate thereof. Naturally; it was put into their minds. So the child who is told not to play on a certain dirty cart but is left to do whatever else he wants, never does want to do anything half so much as play in that cart. And so he plays in it and his mother punishes him for it. She may spank him, she may put him in the corner, she may send him to bed, but the most effective way is to ask him quietly if he thinks it fair that she should be punished by having to wash his pinafore when it is he who has done wrong, and then his conscience will prick him and he will say 'No.' Then the mother can let him scrub the garment till he is tired, though she may well know that it will have little effect on the dirt. But it will on him.

Just one word about play—and activity generally—before leaving the child. Every child wants to play. He must. He must be doing something: Nature makes him. For play is the means by which individual powers are developed and acquired. It is the apprenticeship for the work of life. Therefore let him play and be busy. Give him plenty of toys,—not expensive ones, but such as will not get out of order as soon as he has but looked at them. Every boy wants to know how everything works and how it is made. Remember Toddy and Budge. And from the days when he is building his first castle with a shilling box of bricks,—how we loved our bricks!—to the days when he is constructing a large bridge or building an aeroplane, it is one long process in a direct line. Therefore give him toys,—materials out of which he can make things, and let him be his own engineer.

Now let us turn to the subject proper—teaching. I have spent most of the time on the introduction because it is the most important part of the whole affair. We *must* understand *that* part of it unless our teaching is to be still a failure; for on our knowledge of child nature depends the method of teaching. It is no use saying, 'Let us take the child as we find him,' if we do not know what we find.

Bear in mind, then, that the child is not a miniature specimen of the adult species, but a perfect species or type of himself, and let us take him as we find him. Above all, remember that the child was not made for lessons, but lessons for the child. He is not stuck down in front of us to be a receptacle of what we choose to give him, but we are put before him to bring him up out of himself,—to develop his personality,—to educate his feelings,—to lead him from the known to the unknown. And so the teacher's test of good work done is not the test of a parrot, whether the child can say his lessons with every word correct, but of a self-active, developing soul. And to bring out the best that is in the child, to expand and enrich his already existent interest, to develop his personality, a method of teaching has been brought out that is intended to take him as we find him and use all the qualities with which nature has endowed him, making them all work together for the good of the child—instead of the present system of crushing out what cannot be of immediate use. The child is entitled to all that goes with childhood, and this system aims at getting the perfect child, instead of the youthful adult.

The modern Sunday school, therefore,—and this is what is generally known as the Archibald method,—will be organised somewhat on the following lines. It will be highly decentralised, divided into several departments, each of which shall be governed by its own superintendent. In his book on 'The Sunday School of Tomorrow,' Mr. Archibald lays down three principles which underlie the grading of the decentralised Sunday school:—

1. The scholars must be graded.
2. The lessons must be graded.
3. The method of teaching must be graded.

And I think that everyone will agree with that. Then he proceeds to give the following departments which will form the basis of organisation :—

1. The Cradle Department
2. The Beginners' Department
3. The Primary Department.
4. The Junior Department.
5. The Intermediate Department.
6. The Senior Department.
7. The Adult Department.
8. The Home Department.

And running through them is the Teachers' Training Department. Let me say a word on each of them.

The first consists of children who are too young to attend the school—i.e., below four years of age. All new babies—brothers and sisters of present scholars, or children of parents who attend the adult department,—are eligible, and the superintendent must keep acquainted with the new babies, secure their names for the Cradle Roll, and see that each cradle roll baby receives a card on its birthday. As soon as the child is old enough to attend the beginner's Class, his name is removed from the Cradle Roll, and a special note of invitation and welcome to the Beginners' Department is sent to him or his mother.

The BEGINNERS' DEPARTMENT consists of children of four and five years. They have regular lessons, if possible, under a trained kindergartner. But as this department is to be found only in the most highly organised schools, and is not practicable or needed by most of us, we will leave it and pass on to the

PRIMARY DEPARTMENT, which is the one division above all others that needs care. To this department must be given the best of everything,—teachers, accommodation, furniture. The Primary Department is not merely an Infants' Class : it is a department in itself, ruled by its own superintendent, who should be a trained kindergartner, as she has to superintend all the teaching that goes on, and train those who are learning to teach. It has a separate room, and it has its own hymns and exercises. The children are not asked to sit still and listen to a lesson during the whole hour : the occupation varies : singing, praying, marching, story-telling, drawing, all help to pass the hour pleasantly as well as profitably for the little mites who attend.

Here is the programme of the afternoon's lessons as it is carried out at Bank Street (Bolton). The children take off their hats and jackets in the ante-room, then line up and, as the pianist plays a march, march into the class room, and take their places. This is immediately followed by the opening hymn and prayer ; after which the registers are marked. Then another hymn is sung. Birthday greetings follow, and the child who has had a birthday during the past week is called to the front and is allowed to put so many flags into a tray of sand, one for each year of his life, the others counting as each one is put in. The rest of the scholars then sing a little verse of good wishes. The Cradle Roll is then marked. Any scholar who has a baby brother or sister brings the new name, written on a slip of paper, to the desk. The paper is put into a small cradle, which the child holds, and a birthday song is sung and a prayer said. The pianist plays another march, and the children, with the assistant teachers, march round the room two or three times, and then take their places in little groups for the lesson. No group should consist of more than four or five children, suitably divided, and the more teachers it is possible to have, the more successful the department is likely to be. The lesson consists of a well-chosen and well-prepared story or subject, and the telling of it takes ten or fifteen minutes, after which the children have to draw or model in clay something that has been suggested to their minds during the course of the lesson. This is called *expression time*, and it serves to bring out the personality of the child, and it really is surprising what good things are done by some of the children. On the afternoon that I was watching them, the lesson had been on ' Spring,' and half the youngsters made models of birds' nests with eggs in them, and even with the mother-bird sitting on the eggs. One boy had evidently seen speckled eggs, but not knowing how to make his clay speckled, he put half the eggs in yellow clay and the other half in green ! After they have had ten minutes or so for their expression time, they resume their original places, and, after another song and prayer, in which they all join, they march out of the room, and the afternoon's school is over, having lasted about an hour.

This department also is most useful in the matter of training young teachers. Scholars between the ages, say, of fourteen and twenty-two, serve their apprenticeship here. They start as 'helpers', and do little at first but attend the preparation class (which is held once a week), help the children with their coats and hats, and take duty when one of the assistants is away. From 'helpers' they are promoted to 'assistants', and after they have served two years or so here, they are promoted to the Junior Department. To keep the teachers always in the same department would defeat the object of this teacher training method, which aims at having a continual stream of young blood passing from the simple duties of helpers to the more exacting ones of regular teachers in the other departments. The children remain till they are about nine years old, when they are transferred to the

JUNIOR DEPARTMENT, which is run on the same lines as the primary, with the lessons a little more advanced and the expression time more suited to the age of these older scholars. Here they stay for two or three years, say from nine to eleven or twelve. Of course these ages are only relative: it is no use moving up a backward child or keeping down a well advanced one, just because he was born on such and such a day. The teachers must be continually on the look out to see that each child is in the class for which he is most suited. This Junior Department is important, as it does seem hard for a youngster to be moved straight from the Primary to the usual Senior school.

The INTERMEDIATE DEPARTMENT comes after the Junior and prepares the children for the upper school.

The SENIOR and ADULT DEPARTMENTS need little notice, as they approximate most nearly to our elder classes in the present schools; with this exception—that if these top classes are not willing to do their share to provide teachers for the junior classes, they shall not be allowed the best rooms in which to meet. And Mr. Archibald lays great stress on this—that the younger the classes the better the rooms should be.

Finally, there is the HOME DEPARTMENT. This is meant to cater for all who from some cause or other are not able to attend school. Perhaps they have left the town, or gone to live too far away, perhaps there is sickness in the house. Those who are attached to the school, but are not able to attend, join the Home Department and promise to study the appointed lesson each week. Once a quarter they are visited by one of the staff of visitors, and helped and encouraged by them. This where tried has proved very successful.

The above outline is but a sketch of what Mr. Archibald suggests as a good form of decentralised Sunday school. But it must be remembered that Mr. Archibald does not profess to deal fully with the older classes: the children up to thirteen or fourteen years of age have been his speciality, and so by the Archibald Method has generally come to be understood that part which deals with the Primary and Junior departments. His idea with regard to the older classes is to drain them as much as possible to make teachers, of course catching them at the right age, so that in the younger classes—the Beginners', Primary, and Junior Departments—you have one teacher or assistant for every three or four children. This gives the teacher a chance, as it is obviously unfair to ask a senior scholar to convert himself into a first-class teacher without any training and any help at all, as I am afraid is only too often done. It is a method, in short, designed to get the best out of the scholar by using all the energies and habits and inclinations with which Nature has so richly endowed him, and to give the teacher an opportunity of giving the best that is in him by training him from the beginning, giving him first the simplest tasks and gradually passing him on to the more advanced, and teaching him how to teach.

Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ.—Romans xiii. 14. What a suggestive word it was for those times, and for ever: that there, in the midst of that corruptest centre of a perishing society, in their buying and selling, in the barracks of the legionaries, in the poor tenement quarters of Rome's worst quarter, or in the palaces of the patrician,—that *there*, openly before all men, they were to put on the Lord Jesus Christ, fashion their living by that life of his, and, by their earnest faith and following, make him indeed their very righteousness.—*Brooke Herford.*

A SHORT INTRODUCTION TO THE GOSPELS.—I.

J. H. WEATHERALL, M.A.

1.—Prefatory

There are thousands of books in English about the Gospels, written from different points of view and for different purposes. This series of lessons is meant for elder scholars and teachers who have not read any or many of these books, but who want to know about the real life and teaching of Jesus.

It is probable that the interest of such scholars and teachers will be chiefly a moral and religious interest, and they will not perhaps be attracted by the literary and historical problems presented by the Gospels. But even the shortest of introductions must enter a little way into such matters. Many of the false ideas, old and new, about Jesus, spring from a faulty idea of the character of the Gospels; and the only satisfactory way to understand what he was and said and did is to know what the earliest recorders thought about him, and how far those recorders can be implicitly trusted.

2.—A Dry Study

It is a common impression that such a study is necessarily hard. No doubt, at the beginning, words like 'Document,' 'Source,' 'Synoptic,' 'Canonical,' 'Greek,' seem as dry as the bones in Ezekiel's thirty-seventh chapter. The unfamiliar always seems difficult. The first hours spent in the study of botany are bewildering and painful because of the many new terms and distinctions. But there is a common idea that Bible things ought to be explainable while you wait; and some good people who know that other sciences must have their dry beginning imagine that all that is worth knowing about the growth and value of the Gospels should be capable of being written out in one-syllable words on half a sheet of notepaper. It is not so. Some patience is needed here also, especially at the beginning. But the study is worth it all; and the reward of it is a faith that is according to knowledge.

3.—The Critics

Another impression which sometimes makes people not willing to enter into the study of the Gospels is that all criticism is negative or destructive. They think that critics are like Browning's 'Cleon,' who boasted—

> 'And I have written three books on the soul,
> Proving absurd all written hitherto
> And putting us to ignorance again.'

It is true that there have been critics who have seemed to take away more than they have ever brought back; true also that critics have very often made mistakes. Criticism, however, is nothing but careful and unprejudiced study; and Gospel-criticism has not produced a greater portion of mistakes than rock-criticism or star-criticism. On the other hand, it has made many rough places smooth and crooked places straight. There are, unfortunately, many matters unsettled yet after all the work of the critics; perhaps they can never be completely settled, because writings have perished which alone could have given the necessary evidence. But it is to the strenuous labour of generations of earnest and sagacious critics that we owe the foundations of a truly historical study of the Gospels. If the critic goes wrong, there are plenty of people eager to expose his errors. And time tries all.

4.—Limitations of a Short Introduction

A complete introduction to the Gospels would enter into many subjects which it will not be possible to consider here. The Gospels are a part of a wider literature, some of it within and some of it outside of the New Testament. There is a branch of introduction called the '*Canon*' which explains why just twenty-seven books are included in the New Testament, and why there are four and only four Gospels among them. The 'Canon' cannot be dealt with here, though we shall mention some other Gospels which once enjoyed some authority. Another branch of introduction deals with the '*Text.*' In the case of any ancient writings, we want to know whether the words transmitted to us are those actually written by the presumed authors. In the case of the New Testament the evidence is very rich from the fourth century onwards, for the text was copied and re-copied innumerable times. And with the help of early translations, and quotations in the works of scholars of known date, we can go still further back. These and similar matters belong to *Textual Criticism.* I shall quote later on

some interesting passages from old Gospel Manuscripts which are not represented in our English Testament, but Textual Criticism must also be excluded from these lessons. Dr. Drummond lately published a helpful little book called 'The Transmission of the Text of the New Testament,' which may be consulted for this part of the subject. Another profitable inquiry would be the ideas about the Gospels, their authorship and authority, at various times in the history of the churches. This also, with many other lines of study which can throw light on the Gospels, must be left to the interested student to follow out in larger introductions.

5.—The Preface to Luke

Most of these lessons will deal with the questions why, when, where, how, and by whom, were the Gospels written? And no better starting point could be found than the valuable evidence given to us in the first four verses of the Third Gospel. Here we have a statement from the actual writer of the Gospel about the conditions under which he wrote and his aim in writing. I will quote the passage as it is given in the Revised Version.

> *'Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to draw up a narrative concerning these matters which have been fulfilled among us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word; it seemed good to me also, having traced the course of all things accurately from the first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus; that thou mightest know the certainty concerning the things wherein thou wast instructed.'*

These verses form a single sentence, which seems clumsy to us; but it is in an approved Greek manner, and is clear enough when taken to pieces. The writer does not name himself, but at present I will use the traditional name and call him Luke. (Similarly I will use Matthew and Mark for the respective Gospels; it will be seen later on how slender is the evidence for connecting our Gospels with those names, if understood to imply authorship.) The evidence and the inferences offered by this preface may be summarised thus:—

A.—Statements.

(*a*) *Luke's predecessors.* There were many of them.

(*b*) *Their qualifications.* They were not themselves eye-witnesses, but received their information from those who were either eye-witnesses or contemporaries.

(*c*) *The eye-witnesses.* They were not writers themselves; their reports were handed down verbally.

(*d*) *Luke's own qualifications.* He is not an eye-witness, but he has made careful study of the events.

(*e*) *To whom he writes.* A certain Theophilus; unknown except from the reference here and in Acts 1-1.

(*f*) *Why he writes.* In order that Theophilus might have more careful and exact knowledge of the Christian religion than that provided by his previous instruction.

B.—Inferences.

(*a*) *Luke is dissatisfied with the many earlier narratives, and believes he can improve on them.* This inference rests partly on the word 'taken-in-hand,' which probably, though not certainly, has a depreciatory meaning; but chiefly on the last clause, which assures Theophilus that the new Gospel is more full and exact.

(*b*) *Luke writes for Gentile-Christians.* The name Theophilus is not Jewish but Greek. Some scholars have supposed that Theophilus was not an individual, but that the name is used, representatively, for Gentile-Christians in general. It is more probable that Theophilus was a real individual, known to Luke, and that the Gospel was primarily intended for his personal edification.

(*c*) *Many years have elapsed from the death of Jesus.* It is difficult to say how many; but Luke must be writing, not in the time of the activity of the apostles, but in the generation following, or the generation after that. So far as this preface goes, Luke's Gospel was presumably written between A.D. 60 to 100, and nearer to 100 than 60.

It would be well to learn this preface off by heart. Luke's Gospel has much in common with the others; especially with Matthew and Mark. It is reasonable to suppose that the writers of the other Gospels were actuated by similar motives and worked in a similar way; and the idea of gospel writing given to us by this preface

is all as far as possible from the fancy traditional picture of an Apostle sitting down to write infallible words whispered in his ears by the dove representing the Holy Spirit.

6.—The First Three Gospels and the Fourth

For many reasons it is better to deal with the Fourth Gospel separately, and at a later stage, and to confine our attention at first to Matthew, Mark, and Luke. These three Gospels are related to each other in a way in which none of them is related to John. The four Gospels all tell about the life and teaching of Jesus: but the Fourth Gospel works in a different atmosphere, and with a different selection of material from the others. One striking difference is that the Fourth deals chiefly with a ministry of Jesus in Judæa and Jerusalem, while the other three deal with Jesus in Galilee. Another is that in the Fourth Gospel Jesus does not utter a single parable; in the other three the parable is frequently the method of teaching. The differences go deeper, but it will be easier to enumerate them when the characteristics of the first three have been indicated.

7.—The Synoptic Gospels

The resemblances between the first three Gospels are so close that a special name has been invented to bring them into a group. In 1774 a famous New Testament scholar named John Jacob Griesbach drew up a *synopsis* of these three gospels, so as to avoid the repetitions which would be caused by commenting on them one after the other. In this *synopsis* he put side by side the passages common to all three; and from that time the word 'synoptic' has been generally used for these three gospels, because they agree in presenting a 'common view' (Greek '*synopsis*') of the Gospel story. It is not a very satisfactory name, but it is firmly established.

8.—The Resemblances between the Synoptics

The chief resemblances are of the following kind:—

(*a*) They belong to a similar *type*; they are all narratives of the life and teaching of Jesus.

(*b*) Matthew and Luke have each a preliminary account of the birth of Jesus. Afterwards they agree with Mark in their *range of contents*, proceeding from the ministry of John the Baptist to that of Jesus, and so on to the crucifixion and resurrection.

(*c*) Notes of *time* are only sparingly given, but the Synoptics agree in reporting only one Passover: which means that the whole ministry occupied less than a year. In fact the whole ministry reported in any single Synoptic cannot have exceeded a few weeks. Yet it is the same few weeks which are selected by each evangelist for record.

(*d*) They agree also in the *scene* of the ministry. Jesus preaches in Galilee, with short visits in its neighbourhood: his first public appearance in Jerusalem leads to his arrest and death.

(*e*) They agree further in the *order* in which the several events are recorded, even though there be no logical connection between the successive items. Mark's order is followed by both Matthew and Luke in the main: the exceptions nearly always admit of satisfactory explanation.

(*f*) They agree repeatedly *word for word* over long passages. This can be shown even in an English translation, though the identity is often more striking in the Greek, which often agrees also in small untranslateable particles. One or two specimens of this identity may be given:—

(1) *The Healing of the Paralytic.* See especially the passages—

Matt. 9^{5-6}.

Whether is easier to say thy sins are forgiven or to say Arise and walk?

But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (then saith he to the sick of the palsy) Arise, and take up thy bed, and go unto thy house.

Mark 2^{9-11}.

Whether is easier to say to the sick of the palsy Thy sins are forgiven or to say, Arise, and take up thy bed and walk?

But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (he saith to the sick of the palsy) I say unto thee, Arise, take up thy bed and go into thy house.

Luke 5^{23-24}.

Whether is easier to say Thy sins are forgiven thee or to say, Arise and walk?

But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins (he said unto him that was palsied) I say unto thee, Arise, and take up thy couch, and go unto thy house.

The variations between the three accounts are very trifling, and it is a natural inference that these three accounts have a common origin. The words are mostly alike and the order of the sentences is alike, down to the curious change of the speech, at exactly the same point, away from the scribes to the sick man by means of the parenthetical remark, 'He saith to the sick of the palsy.'

(2) For other cases the reader may compare—

The Feeding of the Five Thousand: Matt. 14-15 fg.—Mark 6-35 fg.—Luke 9-12 fg.

The Transfiguration: Matt. 17-1 fg.—Mark 9-2 fg.—Luke 9-28 fg.

Discourse concerning the End: Matt. 24. —Mark 13.—Luke 21.

These resemblances are only small samples of a feature which recurs throughout the Synoptics; and the question arises, What is the explanation of them? But that question is complicated by some equally striking differences between the same Gospels. The existence of the resemblances along with the differences forms what is known as the '*Synoptic Problem.*' In the next lesson examples of the differences will be given, with some account of the clues for the solution of the synoptic problem. This will unfold the relations of the three Gospels to each other, give a basis for the arrangement of them in their probable order, illustrate the methods of their compilers, and so prepare the way for a consideration of the historical background on which the Synoptics rest.

(*To be continued.*)

Work is good medicine.

A man's best friends are his ten fingers.

Any kind of an honest job is better than no job at all.

Only those who make clean money and do clean things win success.

When country boys come to the city, if they only can hold on to the old sweet ways, they can defy the world.

Sleep eight hours out of the twenty-four, eat three meals a day, and walk on the sunny side of the street.

When a boy fills a house with bugs he is all right, provided he don't run after humbugs. He has the making in him of a great naturalist.

A good farmer is better than a poor doctor, and a good horse-shoer is better than a poor bishop.

—*Robert Collyer.*

NOTES FOR TEACHERS

X.—XVIII.

The Lord's Prayer

(Matt. vi. 9–15.)

W. G. PRICE

X. This is one of two versions of the prayer. Note that it is placed early in the ministry of Jesus, in the Sermon on the Mount, where it stands at the end of a passage dealing with true and false prayer. The other version—Luke xi. 2–4—has a place near the end of Jesus' life, when he was on his last journey to Jerusalem, and we are told that its immediate occasion was the request of the disciples, 'Lord, teach us to pray as John also taught his disciples.' Pious Christians of later times have claimed to locate the exact spot where the prayer was spoken. It is near to Jerusalem, and is marked by the Church of the Paternoster. The shorter form of the version given by Luke should be noted.

The Meaning of these Differences.—Have we here the record of two distinct incidents, or different reports of the same incident? Either theory is possible. If the former is correct each writer only recalled one event and failed to recall the other. If the latter, we also see how forgetfulness must have played its part. Whichever theory be the true one, we are faced by the fact that the Gospels are only an imperfect account of the teaching of Jesus, and though what has come down to us is a great heritage, the Gospel, as Jesus taught it, must have been far greater and sublimer.

The Origin of the Prayer.—It is fittingly called the Lord's Prayer, for it was unique and original upon the lips of Jesus. But its originality lay not so much in its language as in the way its different clauses are combined and grouped together. The clauses themselves were probably not spoken for the first time by Jesus. Almost without exception they were parts of prayers in common use by the pious Jews of his time. Some of them had doubtless been in use for centuries before his day, and what Jesus did was to gather up these well-known appeals to God and group them together in one fresh petition. Such an origin does not take away from the value of the prayer. It increases it rather. The prayer is seen to have the rich association not only of Christian use, but of

Hebrew use as well, and it serves to link our own worship with that of the Psalmists and Prophets. Moreover, this origin of the prayer is a sign of the great-mindedness of Jesus. He recognised the good which he found in the world, and could express his own feelings of devotion in the pious words of other men. It mattered nothing to him where the good word, the pious example revealed itself, whether in Jew or Samaritan, it was thankfully gathered in as the material of a nobler temple of faith and conduct.

The Purpose of Jesus in Teaching this Prayer.—He did not intend it to be a permanent and fixed form of prayer, nor could he foresee the universal use of the prayer to-day. He was more concerned with the manner of prayer than the form. 'After this manner therefore pray ye,' i.e., in this simple spirit as opposed to the unspiritual manner, the mere showy way of saying prayers that men may be impressed. We Christians very rightly make much of this prayer. But there is a danger in any form of prayer often repeated; the spirit is apt to become obscured by our familiarity with the words, and the very object which Jesus had in view when he suggested the prayer is defeated. Here is seen the value of a closer study of the petition we so often take upon our lips.

XI. Our Father which art in heaven.—Oliver Wendell Holmes once said, in effect, that the first two words of this clause, 'Our Father,' contain the sum of all religion. It is certainly fitting and significant that they should stand at the very beginning of the prayer Jesus taught his disciples. For the Gospel is essentially the Gospel of the divine Fatherhood. That is the great central thought of Christ's teaching (Cp. Parable of Prodigal Son). It is this which made his teaching the Gospel, or the 'good news,' for it brought to the world a hope and an inspiration it had not received so richly before.

Not an entirely new thought.—Compare Psalm 68-[5], Psalm 103-[13], Jeremiah 31-[9]. Yet these are isolated instances, rare exceptions in the Old Testament. Much more often God is spoken of as Judge, Ruler, or King. The attributes of his nature chiefly dwelt upon are those of power, justice, majesty, all of them real and not to be forgotten, but none of them implying that close, tender kinship with man, the thought of which pervades the teaching of Jesus, and makes the very atmosphere of his life. Nor is it a narrow conception of fatherhood. It is the universal Fatherhood of God which Jesus teaches. And along with this thought go its corollaries, the sonship of all mankind to God, and the brotherhood of the human race.

The effect of this doctrine of the Fatherhood.—(1) Theological: There can be little doubt that to his persistent and prominent teaching of the divine Fatherhood is largely due the later thought that Jesus himself—in a unique sense—was the son of God. (2) Moral: The immediate effect of the teaching is seen in the command of Jesus to his followers, 'Go ye out into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.' The missionary spirit arose from it. The man who first obeyed the Master's command—St. Paul—was formerly a narrow-minded Pharisee, trained in the belief that the Jews alone were God's chosen people. The Gospel of the universal Fatherhood of God broke down his narrowness, and the once bigoted persecutor became a world-missionary. Under the inspiration of this thought it was not long before rich Roman masters were found sitting at worship side by side with their slaves. This was a great change. One Roman had written of 'the slave or any other animal.' But Origen the Christian writes of the followers of Jesus, 'they refuse no one, not even the common slave.' His disciple, Pamphylus, educated a young slave, brought him up to his own level, and made him wear the philosopher's mantle. They afterwards suffered the same martyrdom. It was the beginning of the end of slavery. This thought of the divine fatherhood and of human brotherhood has been the greatest incentive to men and women in the uplifting of their fellow-beings. It has sent the missionary—Livingstone, for example—into the heart of dark continents to uplift the people there. It sent Father Damien to spend his life among the poor lepers at Molokai. It has sent men and women into the slums of our great cities, to the gates of the prison and into the prison itself—instance John Howard—in order to help and save.

The hope of the future.—This lies in our deeper realisation of the divine fatherhood and human brotherhood. Some people

speak as though religion stands in the path of progress. No doubt much which is called religion does this. Bigotry and uncharitableness, cruelty and strife, have often been exhibited in the name of religion. But true religion never leads to these things. The religion which is based on the universal Fatherhood of God and Brotherhood of Man is sure to be a religion of kindness. If we think of those around us as being akin to us only in outward form, we cannot know the same stimulus to social service as when we realise that we are children of a common Father, with deep spiritual claims upon one another.

XII. Hallowed be thy name.—The hallowing of God's name means, among other things, our dissociating from it all those dark thoughts which are out of keeping with the highest ideal of goodness. Father Taylor, of Boston, the famous Methodist preacher, once heard a brother minister preach a sermon on hell and the punishment in store for sinners. 'Is that your God?' said Father Taylor when the service was over; 'Why, that's my devil.' To his gentle mind harshness and vindictiveness were evil things. He could not think of them as divine qualities, belonging to a holy being, whose name is to be hallowed. God is sometimes thought of as only favouring the people of one church or creed. That is dishonouring his name. It is often taught that his heaven is denied to those who have not passed through some ceremony performed by a particular class of men. That also is dishonouring his name. Our thoughts of God's character must be high thoughts. We must think of what is best and noblest in the people we know, and think of God as being all that and more. God is purer, kinder, more loving than the best of mankind.

Readers of Whittier's poem, 'The Minister's Daughter,' will remember the little girl's difficulty. Her father in his May morning sermon had told of Adam's fall—

> And how, thenceforth, the wrath of God
> Rested on each and all;
> And how of his will and pleasure
> All souls, save a chosen few,
> Were doomed to a quenchless burning,
> And held in the way thereto.

But to the gentle child-heart such a God was not holy. She had an ideal of goodness far higher than that which her father linked with the name of God. And when the father tells her that in spite of God's dark decrees 'we must fear him and love him still'—

> 'O I fear him,' said the daughter,
> 'And I try to love him too,
> But I wish He were good and gentle,
> Kind and loving as you.'

God did not come up to her best ideal. That best ideal was one of loving fatherhood. Such must be our thought of God. Let us believe that it is not mere chance which brings those two petitions together in the Lord's prayer—first 'Our Father' and then 'Hallowed be thy name.' To realise the truth of the one is an immediate step taken towards the other.

Again, we hallow God's name by using it reverently, never lightly and thoughtlessly. It is possible to have a very hallowed conception of God, and yet at the same time to take his name carelessly upon our lips. We may speak the name automatically, and sing it in hymn and psalm with more attention to the musical note than to the great name itself. But God's name can only be hallowed by our reverent use of it. It is said that when the old Hebrew religious writer came to the word expressing 'God,' he laid down his ordinary pen of steel and wrote the name with one of pure gold. The Jews had one name for God which none but the priests were allowed to utter. Its pronunciation was a carefully guarded secret among themselves, and when it was written the consonants only were used, so that a sacred name might not be debased by too common a use. To-day we try to supply the missing sounds, but though one scholar speaks of Jahveh and another of Jehovah our pronunciation of the Hebrew ineffable name can be only conjectural.

A hallowed use of the divine name does not call for this, but we may well learn a lesson from this excessive reverence of old. Worship is not to be played with. If we always had the consciousness of God's infinite majesty and goodness we could never sing a thoughtless praise or recite a thoughtless prayer.

In an old book of moral laws (Deut. v. 11) we read, 'Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain, for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain.' This seems to imply some punishment for the empty use of the holiest name. The punishment is

clear. It is the failure to receive God's response. It is only by our hallowed use of the name of God that the spirit of God can enter our hearts with its blessing.

XIII. Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.—Observe the change that occurs in Jesus' thought of God. In this third petition it is no longer the Fatherhood of God he has in mind, but the *kingship* of God. The prayer also concludes with the same thought. It is a variation which needs no justification. God is infinite. He touches our life in countless ways. He stands to us in countless relationships. His attributes cannot be exhausted and summed up in one name—not even in the great name of Father. That name is after all only a symbol. It is not a description of God, who cannot be described. The men and women who have known him best have known this most. Jesus knew it. In this fact we have the simple reason why at one time he speaks of God as a father, at another time as a master who gives his servants their allotted task, at another time as a judge, and again, as in this prayer, as a king, ruling over a kingdom.

What does Jesus mean by the Kingdom of God?—His meaning is found in the latter part of this same petition. 'Thy will be done on earth as in heaven.' The kingdom of God is extended wherever the will of God is done. Those belong to the kingdom who submit to the will of God, who obey his laws and commandments. It is not confined to nations, churches, or sects (Cp. Matthew vii. 21). It is conditioned by our own inward harmony with the spirit of God, not by belief or outward connection with religious organisations. We can only live in the kingdom according to our sympathy with its laws. A little reflection will make this clear.

The condition of our enjoyment of the material world around us, the flowers and trees, the valleys and hills, the rivers and seas, is not a mere belief that they are beautiful. No mere connection with agricultural or horticultural societies will serve us. The condition of enjoyment is a love of the beautiful. Our hearts must be in tune with the beauty around us. A man who lives in the midst of lovely scenes may be all unconscious of their beauty, while the heart of a child living in some city slum is thrilled with rapture by the beauty of a few feeble window plants. What is the condition of our enjoying the company of the wise and learned? Not the mere belief that they are wise and learned—that by itself would make for our discomfort—but the love of wisdom and learning, and the desire for these things. Sympathy, too, is necessary if we would enjoy the company of the good and noble among men: the love of goodness in ourselves. Whether it is the beauty of a flower, or a well stored mind, or the beauty of holiness, it can only be our own joy when there is that within ourselves which answers to its appeal. We enjoy only what we are fit for. The kingdom of God is within us.

This is always the condition of our enjoyment of the blessings of God, of living deeply in his kingdom. Heaven neither here nor hereafter will be thrust upon us or enjoyed by a mere 'I believe.' It is given to those who can receive it. It means submission to the divine will.

Heaven may come below.—'Thy kingdom *come*, thy will be done on *earth* as in heaven.' Jesus was not given much to otherworldliness. His chief concern was for this present world. He believed deeply in the life to come in the Father's house of many mansions, but he gave the weight of his thought and energy to the betterment of this life below. As disciples of Jesus this is the phase of the kingdom we should think of most. This belief in the possibility of the kingdom of God on earth should recommend the Gospel of Jesus to all social reformers who are working for peace and purity and justice and brotherhood. Let us bear the pressing problems of life in mind when we offer up this petition—the destruction of life on the battlefields, the infant mortality, the unemployment of industrious men and women, the excessive drudgery of others, and let it be the prayer for a social life free from these things and from all evil.

XIV. Give us this day our daily bread.—Someone has said that the Lord's Prayer binds heaven to earth and earth to heaven: this because it rises into the highest and sublimest thought of God, and descends to the bodily needs of man, recognising the practical wants of daily life. Jesus never made a cleavage between material things and spiritual. He believed that everything has its origin and being in God. The

lilies of the field, the birds of the air, the bodies of men with their needs—all to him were the work of God, 'the vision of Him who reigns.' Of the faults and sins of mankind he was deeply, painfully aware, and against them he waged continual war. But when he saw a man abusing life, Jesus did not declaim against life on that account. When he saw gluttony and greed in eating and drinking he thought no less of the natural need of food and drink which had been made the occasion for such display of evil. He saw in every phase of this material life the design and work of God, and knew that the highest life has its base in the lowest.

The first condition of human welfare is the supply of daily food. Carlyle speaks of hunger as one of the great moving powers of society, a stimulus to the world's progress. Another writer has said, 'When the great Architect began to build his human dwelling-place, the soul of man, the foundations of the living temple had to be laid in the material conditions of human nature. If man's body had never hungered for bread, his soul would never have learnt to hunger for God. By working for food we learn at last to toil for truth.' To labour is to pray. Every task is a prayer for daily bread, which God answers not only with bread for the body, but with nourishment for the heart and mind. As a result of his work, the worker is kept energetic and purposeful. He is a better man for it in all the relationships of his life.

But this bodily need, intended for our blessing, is often the source of human misery. Too often, contrary to the will of God, it goes unsatisfied, making one of the deepest tragedies of life. The prayer, 'Give us this day our daily bread,' should be a plea for the needy of the world. It should bring us remembrance of those forced into idleness, unable to take part in the world's great prayer of toil, suffering, hunger, and seeing those dear to them in want of the bread they would but cannot earn. Robert Burns used to say that he could not well conceive a more mortifying picture of human life than a man seeking work.

> See yonder poor o'erlaboured wight,
> So abject, mean, and vile,
> Who begs a brother of the earth
> To give him leave to toil,

Hardly less tragic than this is drudgery, when almost every hour of the day must be spent in the prayer of toil. When work is slavery, and body and soul are only just kept together by an endless round of toil God's higher purposes in labour cannot be fulfilled.

XV. Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us.—What does the forgiveness of God mean? Let us dismiss the idea that God is ever angry with his children. He is too strong and patient for that. God has punishments for evildoers, but they are the corrections of care and affection not acts of vengeance. God is love. He is ever seeking to enter the hearts of his children, and when we do wrong we close our life against God to that extent, and lay ourselves open to the natural penalties of refusing the good and doing the evil. As soon as we do right, and to that extent, God's spirit becomes operative within us. This is the real 'atonement,' the real reconciliation of man to God. We call it forgiveness. But it is something diviner than that. It is the entrance into our hearts of a love which has ever been offering itself.

The spirit of forgiveness in ourselves is one condition of this reconciliation with God. Spiritual things are only spiritually discerned. Jesus was always teaching this. Cp. Parable of Ten Virgins: 'Let *your* light be burning' if you would meet God and enter into his house of rejoicing. 'With what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again.' God gives according to our capacity to receive. This is one of the clearest teachings of Jesus, and his doctrine of forgiveness belongs to it. The heart that cherishes the memory of wrongs is no place for God.

Is it a little thing or a great thing we ask when offering this prayer? 'As we forgive them that trespass against us.' How much is that? It is a great deal if we are always quick to forget and forgive; little, or nothing, if we are vindictive, resentful, unforgiving. The forgiving spirit is one of the first needs of our daily life. Offence is easy. We are all liable to do wrong to others, and if we remembered all each other's offences the accumulated sense of wrong would make us all unhappy; it would pollute and poison the atmosphere of our family and social life. The forgiving spirit is the great cleanser. It passes

through our little circles like the fresh air of heaven passing through a pestilent house. It restores friendships, keeps families united, and makes the world a place worth living in. It is a spirit which must grow among us.

The forgiving spirit should also be applied to the criminal. Some offences are so serious that they cease to be a matter between private individuals and become the concern of the state, which makes itself the instrument of their punishment. Punishment is necessary. But the spirit of forgiveness may and should express itself in methods of punishment that are remedial rather than vengeful. This is the happy tendency of our time. The forgiving spirit should also be shown in a greater readiness to trust the wrong-doer, and to give him opportunities to redeem his character and regain his standing when punishment has been inflicted.

XVI. Lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil.—In what sense does God lead us into temptation? He is the maker of all things and must therefore be primarily responsible for the existence of temptations, whether they immediately spring from a personal Satan or—as they really do—from our own lower nature. God has given us our nature, with its possibilities of good and evil. It may be compared to a piece of ground which is capable of producing both weeds and flowers. Many weeds have in them the making of flowers, and it is our task to change these into flowers, and, at the same time, to root out all useless weeds. What we call temptations are our lower inclinations and desires. They come from human nature in its uncultivated state, when it has not been tilled according to the directions of God revealed to us in good thoughts, in conscience, and in pure and noble examples.

God has brought us into a life where temptations abound for a wise purpose. Free will, the power to do evil as well as to do good, is necessary for the development of character. Life on any other plan could not have been so well for us in the end. In R. L. Stevenson's story, 'The Master of Ballantrae,' Mackellar says to the Master, 'I do not think you could be so bad a man if you had not all the machinery to be a good one.' The reverse is also true. None of us could be as good as God desires us to be if we had not all the machinery to be bad. God desires our virtues to be living virtues, our souls living souls with the perfection gained from self-striving, not the perfection of the sculptor's marble figure. Only through the struggle can we win the crown. For this reason St. James writes (Epistle of James i. 2), 'Count it all joy, my brethren, when ye fall into manifold temptations.' See also James i. 12.

Why then the prayer, 'Lead us not into temptation'? Should we pray to avoid that which is intended for our good? The explanation is that Jesus was intensely human. He knew the dangers of temptation, the chances of defeat as well as the joys of victory. On his lips it was the prayer of humble self-distrust—a self-distrust which was the source of his strength. Compare his other petition, 'Father, if it be possible let this cup pass from me, nevertheless not my will but thine be done.' Both prayers alike came from a humble sense of weakness. But that sense of weakness is a condition of spiritual strength. To be forewarned is to be forearmed. The soldier is no less brave and manful for rating his foes at their proper value. It is when courage is allied to discretion that we have the best conditions of victory on the field. That is also true of life's warfare. It is not the Christian warrior who treats temptations lightly who finds them easiest to resist. A certain distrust of self is safest, for that leads to alertness, to the strengthening of defences, and to reliance on God.

Temptations are not to be sought, but avoided rather with a due sense of their danger and the darkness of sin. Then, when unsought temptations come, they are more likely to be met with that success which brings the feeling of joy that God has given us dangers and difficulties to overcome. When we enter into the spirit of Jesus, we shall also do what we can to remove temptations from the lives of those around us.

XVII.—Duty at the Stream.

F. J. GOULD

A KNIGHT rode out to the chase. The deer leaped in the forest, and soon would the fleet-footed creatures fall beneath the stroke of the hunter's arrows or spears. A squire bore the lord's weapons, and many

servants and dogs followed in a noisy train.

As he crossed the meadow near a stream, the tinkling of a bell caught his ear.

A priest passed by towards the river, and he carried with great care a little box ; and before him walked a servant, who seemed to warn bystanders that in the box was something precious and sacred. The box contained the Holy Bread from the Altar—and this bread (such was the Roman Catholic faith) was the very body of Christ,—the ' Corpus Christi.'

At once the knight leaped from his steed, doffed his helm, and bent low to the ground before the priest and the Host ; and his followers made a like salute.

The priest hurried on. When he came to the bank of the stream, he found that the rains from the hills had so swollen its waters that the little wooden bridge had been swept away. He gently set the Host on the grass, and took off his shoes, and girded his loins, and was about to plunge into the stream.

' Why do you do this ? ' cried the knight, who had been watching his movements.

' Sir Count,' he said, ' I am hastening to the bedside of a dying man, in order to give him the last consolations of religion.'

' Take my horse, and go on your holy errand,' bade the knight.

The priest crossed the stream on the Count's horse, and thus the sacred bread was kept from wet and injury, and the comfort of the sacrament was the sooner brought to the sick man.

Next morning the priest led back the horse to the door of the castle.

' God forbid,' said the knight, ' that ever I should chase the roebuck, or ride to battle, on a steed that bore the Body of Christ. Keep it, good priest, not for your own ease, but to carry the Host if ever time is short and the need is great.'

Such is the story given in one of the ballads of the famous German poet, Schiller. We will not now ask whether the Catholic belief in the Corpus Christi is just and true. For my part, I respect the honest faith of the Catholic in the virtue of the sacred Host. But what we can all admire is the priest's sense of duty. Nothing would stay his passage to the spot where a neighbour's weakness claimed his pity and love. He braved the loud-sounding stream,

This loud-sounding stream rolls along the valley of our everyday life. Every day some task awaits us on the other side. Will we, like folk of courage, dare the waters ?

' In all things be men.' These five words are printed on a badge worn by the boys in a certain school. Far away from England is the school, and the tint of the boys' skin is darker than that of our English faces. The school is at Srinagar, on the River Jhelum, in Cashmere, India.

Now, on the badge, beside the five words, one may see a picture of two boat-paddles crossed. If you were to ask the teacher of the school, the Rev. C. E. Tyndale- Briscoe, the meaning of the badge, he would say :

> The paddles stand for hard work and strength. The heart-shaped blade for kindness.

And the boys know how to handle the real wooden paddles. They have been taught to manage a boat on the stream. They take part in races, in festivals, in pleasant excursions up and down the happy river.

But there are some times when the paddles are called for, not in race or festival or summer trip, but in the stern task of saving life. And then these Cashmere boys do their duty, as did the Catholic priest in Schiller's noble ballad of the Host.

Rain fell four days. Snow melted on the northern hills, and torrents rushed down the gorges into the Jhelum river. A telegram flashed the news from Islamabad, forty-five miles up-stream, that the flood was coming down upon Srinagar city.

Alarm !

The folk who lived on the edge of the Jhelum hurried to place their most precious possessions in safety,—either in boats or on the backs of animals, or in carts, so as to hurry away from the scene of peril.

Coolies worked in wild haste, under the command of officers, to build up banks of earth, stone, and wood along the edge of the stream, in order to protect the low-lying streets of Srinagar.

The flood !

Over walls, over gardens, over meadows, over the thresholds of houses pours the masterful water, and none dare say it nay.

A number of people—the poorest class of people in the town—have not been able to remove their goods and their families in time. They are of the meanest classes or ' castes.' Their richer neighbours have

taken no notice of them, for they are but low-caste folk. Men, women, children, dogs, even poultry, are huddled in wretched groups on the roof-tops of mud cottages, and their cry goes up to heaven as the angry flood races round the feeble huts, which will soon crumble and give way!

The cry is heard.

It is heard by the boys who wear the badge of the heart-shaped paddles, and whose motto is 'In all things be men.'

They put out their school boats. This is no race for pleasure and prizes. It is a work of mercy and salvation. These strong Cashmere lads are going to the aid of their weak brethren—Indians like themselves, though of lowly caste.

The people are rescued.

As the boats paddle their course to and fro (for more than one journey is needed), some of the people on the river bank shout out:

'Shame on you for defiling your caste! Shame on you for touching these creatures of common birth!'

But these reviling words do not check the heart-shaped paddles, nor chill the blood in the hearts of the Cashmere lads. Their motto is not 'In all things be members of a caste,' but 'In all things be men.' As men they go forth to relieve those in danger, not asking what social class the distressed folk belong to. For, in India, in England, and in all lands, 'we are members one of another'; and, no matter what our birth or our manner of earning an honest livelihood, or the amount of our income, we are children of a common Family. And that is why we owe duties to one another. That is why the call of duty is so strong and earnest; and they who love their fellowmen will not shrink because the stream is at the flood.

XVIII.—Boys and Girls of the Bible

Samuel (I Sam. i, iii.)

H. FISHER SHORT

SAMUEL, one of the greatest heroes of early Israel, lived at one of the great turning points of its history. He was the last of the Judges, those rugged and self-appointed leaders who, at critical times, governed the Sons of Israel before they became a nation. And he was the first of the regular succession of Prophets of whom Isaiah was such a conspicuous example. But his distinction was that he organised the semi-barbarous Israelites into a nation, and anointed Saul to be their king.

In this lesson, however, we are not concerned with Samuel the man, but with the little Samuel whose portrait has been so lovingly painted by Sir Joshua Reynolds, James Sant and other artists.

Most big boys and girls know the tender story of the child who lived in the Temple at Shiloh where he was trained by the aged Eli for the work of the priesthood. Hence this lesson is, especially, for little people who may not have heard the story, though it may prove of interest to those who need to have their memories refreshed.

Before the little boy was born, Hannah, his mother, was very sad. She had a loving heart and longed for a little son upon whom to lavish her affection. For a long time her yearning was disappointed and she almost despaired. But one day, when she was at the temple, she decided to ask God to give her a baby boy and promised, if her prayer were answered, to consecrate him to the holy priesthood. By and by she pressed a baby to her breast, and her happiness was complete.

Doubtless she shrank from giving up her treasure, but she remembered and kept the solemn vow she had made. As soon as the little fellow was old enough to live apart from his mother, Hannah, with an aching heart we may be sure, took him to the Temple and left him with Eli. Perhaps he shed just a few tears, as any other boy would do who knew his mother was leaving him for a long time; but recalling that his mother had told him to be brave, as no doubt she had, he would brush away his tears, stiffen his upper lip, and give his mind to his new life with its new duties. Dressed in a linen ephod, the garment worn by priests, the little boy had to open the doors of the Temple at sunrise, and put out the sacred candle at night. He appears to have seen his mother but once a year, when she came to Shiloh for the yearly sacrifice, bringing with her a little robe for the boy. How tender those meetings must have been, and how eagerly anticipated!

Samuel seems to have slept in what was called the Holy of Holies, a sacred part of the Temple where the Ark of God was kept. And this was the scene of the little drama

so dear to the hearts of thousands of boys and girls.

One night, shortly after Samuel had lain down to sleep, he was aroused by someone calling his name. Thinking that Eli wanted him, he hurried to the old man and said, 'Here am I!' But Eli said, 'I called not, lie down again.' No sooner had he returned to his bed than again he heard his name called. Once more he ran to Eli, who said kindly, 'I called not, my son; lie down again.' He obeyed as before, and a third time a voice called 'Samuel!' and a third time he went to Eli and said, 'Here am I, for thou calledst me.' Then it flashed into the mind of the old priest that God must have some message for the boy, so he said, 'Go, lie down, and it shall be, if he call thee, thou shalt say, Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth.' Going back to his bed he lay down and waited and, we are told, 'the Lord came and stood and called Samuel, Samuel.' And the boy answered, 'Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth.' And God began to speak to him.

There is a Sunday school hymn which begins:—

'I think, when I read that sweet story of old,
When Jesus was here among men,
How he called little children as lambs to his fold,
I should like to have been with him then.'

Many boys and girls sing that hymn with real meaning. How they envy the happy children of Galilee, who were brought to Jesus that he might bless them! And were not the wee Galileans very fortunate? There are grown-up men who would go to the end of the world and give up all they possess if they could see Jesus, if they could look into his wonderful eyes, hear his gentle voice, and feel the touch of his hand. But if to come face to face with our beloved Master would be a thing so precious, how much more precious it would be to hear the voice of God, whom Jesus called his Father and our Father. Now, strange as it may seem, whilst we cannot hear the voice of Jesus, we may, if we listen, hear the voice of our Heavenly Father. Yes, even little children may hear it; and some do hear it. You may say, 'God has not spoken to me.' But he has; indeed, he is always speaking to you, and quite as plainly as he spoke to Samuel.

And now let me explain to you that our story has not to be read literally. That is to say, the story is not true as your history books are true, but is true in the same way that the parables of Jesus are true. Most of the people to whom Jesus preached were simple-hearted; hence he taught them by means of parables, much in the same way your teachers sometimes instruct you by fairy tales. When you hear of fairy Kind Spirit or demon Stony Heart, you know that the first stands for you when you are gentle and unselfish, and that the second is you again when you are not quite the nice little boy or girl that mother likes best. You may now see how we may read and understand the story of Samuel. Just as nearly every fairy tale is a story about you, so this old Bible story is equally a story about every little boy or girl in our class. Let us see.

You remember how happy was Hannah when God gave her a little son. It was just the same with your mother. When you were born, she was so pleased and loved you so much that she called you the best little baby in the world. One day she took you to church to be christened, and in the little service, of which you were the central figure, your mother did two things: she thanked God for having given you to her, and then she promised to give you back to God by training you for his service. When Hannah took Samuel to the Temple, she did almost the same. The only difference was that she left her little boy to be trained by Eli, whilst your mother took you home again where she trains you herself. Thus when your mother tells you about God and his goodness, and how he likes his little children to be loving and obedient and truthful, she is doing what Eli did when Samuel went to live with him in the Temple. You may be thinking that you have no duties like those of Samuel, that boys do not open the church doors in the morning and turn out the lights after evening service. Quite true; but we are all servants of God and serve him in many different ways. When you were old enough your mother sent you to Sunday school and also took you to church. And you became as much a servant of the Lord as was Samuel, though you did not, like him, wear an ephod. And when you are attentive to your teacher and try to learn the lessons, when you sit quietly in church or try to sing nicely the beautiful hymns of praise to God, and,

best of all, when you return home and try to please your mother by being kind, and willing, and cheerful, you are serving God in the ways that are well-pleasing to him. 'But Samuel became a priest,' you may say. Yes, and when you are old enough, you may become Sunday school teachers; and some of the girls, to whom God has given sweet voices, may sing in the church choir, whilst some of the boys may become preachers and even ministers. And how proud and pleased mother would be to see her daughter ministering unto the Lord in Sunday school or in choir, or to see her son teaching little boys to be brave and upright and useful, or standing in the pulpit preaching about God's love and holiness.

Now let me tell you how God speaks to boys and girls. Another little hymn you know will help us here. The first verse runs:—

'I asked the little joyous bird,
Who taught him how to fly,
And sing his songs so sweetly in
The bright blue morning sky;
He told me it was God above,
Who gave to him his wing,
And taught him how to build his nest,
And taught him how to sing.'

The second verse gives us the message of the 'little lovely flower.' In the third verse, the 'little twinkling star' tells us that God it was 'who bade him shine so bright.' While in the last verse the little singer himself speaks. You are all little singers, and I think you mean what you say when you sing:—

'Since all things, then, look up to God—
The flower, the star, the bird;
And all obey his holy laws,
And listen to his word;
I, too, although a child, will try
His bidding to obey,
That I may learn to please him too,
And serve as well as they.'

Does not this pretty song answer your question, 'How does God speak to me?' The little bird, the tiny flower, the glistening star, do not speak with words as we do, but they tell us—do they not?—'God made us all and God is love.' Nay, God himself speaks to you through them. He speaks to you of his wisdom, his power, and his beauty.

'But God called Samuel by name,' you may say. Yes, but you must not forget the story is a parable. In the parable God is described as coming like a man into the place where Samuel slept. But God is not a man and does not speak with a man's voice. He speaks to us through the singing birds, the pretty flowers, the glistening stars, and every beautiful thing; but he really speaks in our hearts. We do not hear a voice, and yet something within us tells us very quietly that God is speaking to us. And when Eli told Samuel to say, 'Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth,' he simply meant what I would say to you. If you would know what God is saying to you, you must pay attention to him. And, if you do so, you will hear what, in the Bible, is called the 'still small voice.'

In conclusion, let me tell you one way God does speak to you. A little boy I know very well used to talk about his 'other little boy,' who was very good. This other little boy was always clean and always kind. Like the little boy I know, I believe you have all got either another little boy or another little girl. Haven't you? This may sound like a riddle, but it is nothing of the kind. You are each two little boys or two little girls rolled into one. You are the little boy or little girl who likes to have the biggest orange, or the largest piece of cake, or the first helping of pudding. Your other little boy or girl would not snatch at the big orange, or grab the big chunk of cake, or cry for the first helping of anything. Is not this other little person you also, as you know you ought to be? You may now see how it is that whenever you snatch and grab and secure the best of anything for yourself you don't feel really happy. How is it? Is it not because something inside tells you that you are not the kind and unselfish little person you ought to be. Now when this happens—and it always happens when you are not kind—God is speaking very softly but very plainly in your heart and telling you that you have done wrong. This may be something new to you, but if you just listen, if you just pay attention to the still small voice in your heart, you will hear God telling you to be truthful and kind and obedient; and if you always try to be your other, your better little self, you will make your mother and father, your brothers and sisters, and all your friends very happy; and when you grow up you will be worthy servants of God and of man

FORTY YEARS AFTER

J. LONSDALE COX

Come here tha little bewty,
Let's hev a lewk at thi things,
Tha'rt bonny enuff for a angel
If tha hesn't getten na wings;
Come, an' hod thi chin up—
Mind what tha does wi thi toas!
Where did ta say t' at came throo?
Ay! but ther's nowt like cloas.

So tha'rt goin' to walk wi t' childer—
Doan't go tummle on t' grass;
But A 'xpect tha'll dew like thi grannie—
Laws! bless us, how time does pass;
It nobbut seems toa three year
Sin A wer just like thisen,
Gerrin ready fer t' field,
As prahd as a cluckin' hen.

Ay, A remember one time
When Bryan Dale wer here,
We wer bahn to walk to Southowram
An' laik in a field up there.
Ah'd getten a nice silk dolman,
An' a puce merino frock,
A could hardlins wait fer mornin'
A'r so throng lewkin' at t' clock.

Bonny day wer Sunday,
An' when A went to bed
Mi mother promised to wakken me,
Shoo'd noan forget, shoo said;
An it rained like owt i' t' mornin'
A didn't want to ger up!—
Them's nice little gloves tha's getten:
Mind when tha hes to sup!

A felt reight mad, for thi granfeyther
An me wer beginnin' to coart:
But stop a bit, what am A thinkin' on,
Tellin' thee owt o' that soart!
Go on, Grannie! Nay, lass,
Tha'rt ta young to know abaht that—
A nice little umberel that is,
It matches thi shoes an' 'at!

What did you do, then, Grannie?
When? Oah, that Whissuntide!
Well, it took up nicely,
So we walked dahn Siddal side;
An' some marlockin' fellows wer impident,
A gav em ther answer streight,
But it made me go red; so thi granfeyther
Leathered one on em reight.

Well, and what then, Grannie?
Whist, nowt fer childer to hear!
Well, but, Grannie! What, lass?
Hush, tha shames me; he kissed me, there.
Did he? Ay, he wor a man,
An' it's twenty year sin he died,
Twenty year come t' time—But, Grannie?
Well, what hes ta getten beside?

When will thi mother be comin?
A like that ribbin; but child,
Yor all tricked aht sa bonny
A'm feared tha'll be gerrin spoiled.
But, Grannie, how did he leather em?
Why, wi his fists fer sure—
His hand wer like a sledge-hammer,
He could send it reight through a doar!

But nivver mind abaht that,
Little gels shouldn't know such things.
But, Grannie, men don't kiss—
Oah, well, nivver mind! When tha sings
Stand streight, an' oppen thi mouth,
An' happen they'll pick thee to goa
An' sit up i' t' quire—ther's no tellin'
If tha'll beat Miss Tankard or noa.

Bring me a bit o' thi cake,
An' doan't let thi coffee spill—
An' here's a penny for spice,
An' doan't go rollin' dahn t' 'ill;
Little lasses mun mind ther manners—
Ay, here's thi mother at last.
Nah, be careful; doan't spoil thi things,
Fer they wear aht sadly ta fast.

THAT BAD HABIT

H. H. H.

There was a man who had a bad habit. Generally when the temptation came to him he gave way. And he said, I hate this evil, but I can't help doing it. Why was I made like this? And he was angry with God.

Now God saw it. And He sent an angel down to help that foolish man.

And the angel found him miserable, ready to quarrel with everybody.

And the man said, Who are you?

And the angel answered, I have come from God to help you.

The man sneered; Does God ever help anyone?

The angel said: Let me prove it to you.

You, what can you do? I—and he was about to say something very wicked, but a look in the angel's eye stopped him, and he added—Well, try!

Then the angel said, Come out of this room; there are too many bad thoughts and influences in it.

So he took him into a bright room upstairs, where there were some books and a desk.

And he reached down a New Testament, and opened it at the Sermon on the Mount. Read that, he said.

And the man took it and began to read. He turned over the pages and looked bored.

I don't see what good this stuff is to me. Besides, I know all that.

Then the angel began to talk to him about it. And they were soon having a fine discussion.

At last the man said: Why, I never thought there was so much in it before

No, said the angel, You never thought about it at all as you read. That was the mistake. Then, he added, Come, you ought to be starting for business. Suppose you get there in time for once. I'm coming with you. But no one will see me or hear except you.

So they went to the city together. And the man got down the books in which he worked, as usual. And soon he got tired, and thought of going to talk to a friend, and let his work slip for half an hour.

You are tired of it, said the angel.

And the man's thought replied : Yes, it is dreary and uninteresting work, and I hate it.

And the angel said, What do these figures mean ?

Mean ? Oh, I don't know.

Each row speaks to me of thought, and of what men have done ; buying, making material ; and the families of those who have done this, and that they have been paid for this. Listen ; and he told him of some. And the man was amazed. And he said, I never thought of this before.

No, said the angel, that is just the matter. You have never really thought about your work before. And after that the man found himself wondering what the figures all meant, and what his putting them down meant ; his thought and energy—what part that played in the service of man.

When the day's work was over, the angel said : Now what are you going to do ?

And the man said, I thought of going to the theatre.

But the angel replied : No ; come with me. And he took him where some people were teaching poor boys to play. And the man asked to be allowed to help. And they were glad to have him. After a little while he began to get interested, but not very much. Then said the angel, As soon as you can, talk to that boy who is playing so badly, and find out about him.

And he did. What he heard made him very sorry for the boy. And he wondered if he could do anything to help him.

And the angel whispered, Get to know him first, and let him learn to love you, and you will find out.

When they said good-night, he told the boy that he would come to his home next night and have another talk with him.

Did you find it interesting ?

I never thought to have so interesting an evening.

No ; there's the pity. You never thought about anyone but yourself before.

Well, said the angel, as they went away And how about that bad habit of yours ?

Oh, I had forgotten.

What, forgotten ? Then—

Why, God has helped me, I suppose.

Foolish man ; and always does if only you will let him.

And the man went home wondering.

And the angel returned to God smiling.

MUGGINS

ALICE EDWARDS

'PLEASE, sir, I want to be a shepherd.' If Muggins had said he wanted to be Chancellor of the Exchequer, he could hardly have created a more profound sensation. He was a diminutive, vacant looking, white-haired boy, fifteen according to the register, but looking not more than twelve. Brought into the school two years before, deserted by father and mother, he had been the despair of his teachers, not so much from any special vice as from his utter incapacity and vacuity. The other boys had given up teasing him, for as they said you could not get any fun out of such a silly ass ; and the master, who had tried threats, persuasions, and punishments all in vain, simply shrugged his shoulders as Muggins took his usual place at the bottom of the class, and concluded to spend his efforts on more promising material. And now he was fifteen, and out he must go, if any one could be persuaded to take him with or without a premium.

He had been called before the schools committee for inspection, and the chairman had put the usual question, 'Well, my lad, and what would you like to be ?' with as little hope of obtaining an answer as if he had been an Egyptian mummy, when the vacant face had brightened for a moment, and he had said, smartly enough, 'Please, sir, I should like to be a shepherd.'

'And what has put that idea into your head, my lad,' said the chairman—'have you ever seen a shepherd ?'

But Muggins had had his say and could not be brought to enter into explanations.

With the help of the other boys, however, and some piecing together of scattered facts, the matter was explained. Last year, the children had all been boarded out in the country, for some months and Muggins with four or five others had been sent to a cottage lying close by the Downs of North Hants. The other boys had soon found companions in the neighbourhood, and were busy with cricket, birds-nesting, fishing and other delights. Muggins, as usual, a lonely wight, wandering round the lanes by himself, came upon a flock of sheep changing their pasture ground.

An excited, fussy collie was barking and yapping at their heels, but they were too used to him to do more than turn their heads and say to each other, 'What a fuss about nothing!'

Something in the soft, round, woolly creatures, the pad, pad of little hoofs along the dusty road, the plaintive 'baa' of some tired ewe, and the crowding together of the flock as if for protection against some unknown foe, stirred an altogether new feeling in the dull brain of Muggins. He followed the shepherd at a respectful distance, but when the flock were safely through the gate that led to the new meadow and were busy with turnips, he ventured nearer.

The shepherd turned a slow glance on the queer figure. . 'Do 'ee like shep?' said he. 'I never see none before,' said Muggins. When this amazing idea had penetrated Hodge's brain, he chuckled for at least two minutes.

'Well, thee be the vurst I ever see as never saw a shep,' said he. 'Do thee come from Lunnon? Volks there do seem a bit daft like. They do 'ave finger posts to tell 'em the way to their own door—and do run round and round like a dog after his tail when they come on the Downs. Old maister's niece came down 'ere on a trip, and 'e brought 'er up to see the shep. "Silly things," sez she, "they are all just alike." "No more nor you and me, miss," sez I, and old maister grinned; and with another reminiscent chuckle Hodge held out a piece of bread and cheese on the end of his knife and gave to Muggins. And then began for the boy the first education he had ever had. He learnt to know one sheep from another, to recognise the voices, to tell with his eyes shut which ewe or ram was calling; and when lambing time came, and the old shepherd put into his arms the first long-legged, helpless, black-faced lamb, and bade him feed it from a bottle, a passion of love and pity welled up in the boy's heart, as if the touch of the creature against him had thawed its frozen surface. And so the first pure joy that had ever come to Muggins was the beginning of a real awakening of his intellect. As he crouched on the ground, clasping the lamb, half afraid to stir for fear of losing it, dim memories of forgotten things welled slowly up in his mind. There was a window in the school chapel with a picture of Jesus carrying a lamb, and on a scroll underneath 'He shall carry the lambs in his arms'—'Like me,' thought Muggins, and the memory somehow comforted and helped him.

And the days passed, and at last the one came on which Muggins had to say goodbye to sheep and shepherd. 'Thee be a raal good boy, I be main sorry to see the last of ye,' said Hodge, and at the kind word the boy's pent up misery burst out, and he flung himself down on the ground and sobbed his heart out.

'I shall run away and come to you,' sobbed he, but Hodge shook his head, 'No, no, don't 'ee do that, but ask the gentlemen to 'ave thee bound to old maister, and we'll make thee a real shepherd.' And at this wonderful idea Muggins had sat up, and rubbed his eyes, and when the time came to go back to school he had carried with him the fixed purpose of going back with or without leave. And here he was, face to face with destiny in the shape of the Chairman of the Schools Committee.

'Please, sir, I want to be a shepherd.' And happily for Muggins the Chairman was a man of discernment, quick to see the possibilities of this undeveloped nature, and ready to help at the critical moment—and so the boy's wish was granted, and a new life began for him in the peace and quiet of the country.

The great end (of the Sunday school) is to awaken the soul of the pupil, to bring his understanding, conscience, and heart into earnest, vigorous action on religious and moral truth, to excite and cherish in him Spiritual Life.—*Channing.*

LIFE AND WORK IN A THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE

Meadville, Pa.

J. A. C. FAGGINGER AUER

I DO not know whether the world at large has formed the conception of an ideal minister. I suppose not. Different men need to be ministered unto in different ways; and there are no two men alike. I do not mean to suggest the possibility of an absolute difference between individuals and individuals. There are indeed *race*-experiences and *world-wide* needs. Men, simply because they are *men*, are subject to limitations; *as a race* man stands in need of certain things. Still, all of those needs are not felt in the same manner by all human beings. One might speak of a centre of gravity which is continually shifting in accordance with the special nature of the age, the race, and the individuals of which the race is composed.

There are periods of history in which the wants of men seem to be wholly of a material kind. At such times the technical sciences advance rapidly, practical men are in demand. The world requires that living energy be changed into food, clothes, and houses. On the other hand, there are periods which turn away from the concrete. They are absorbed in matters of an abstract, fundamental nature. Philosophy rules the world. The world energy is converted into thought, but here often the process stops; thought is not in its turn changed into 'thought made visible,' into matter. It must be remembered, however, that neither the practical nor the philosophical spirit ever succeeds in conquering all of the world. Each one of them is in the predominance when its turn comes, but a part of humanity is always out of harmony with the ruling world-tendency. It may be said therefore that those opposing ideas are not mutually exclusive, but that both of them exist at one and the same time, differing only in temporary influence. . . . There are men of a practical nature and men of a theoretical mind; there are some whose needs are concrete and others who are troubled by problems which are wholly abstract. Both must be helped, but where is the minister who can deal with a matter so complicated as this seems to be?

It is a difficult problem which we have before us. The man whose spirit is weighed down with material troubles must be encouraged. If he comes to us pointing at the suffering of the poor and the unrighteous power of gold, then some one must tell him that justice reigns in spite of it all. If he should speak to us of illness and death, then he must be helped to believe in the final victory of eternal life. And again, if science assures us that it would fain believe, but that its eye cannot perceive anything besides molecules and the unconscious laws which are bound up with matter, then some one must rise up and preach of a faith which is both reasonable and clear-eyed. These men of science must be convinced that there is a power higher than logical reasoning, which may well build the bridge between the highest mountain-top of human knowledge and the city of God which we seem to see in the distance. . . I repeat my question: Where is the minister who can do this difficult work; can such a man be found?

We need not be surprised that in view of the complicated task which awaits the minister of to-day, there should be various opinions with regard to his education.

First of all, we meet with the view that his training should be absolutely academical. The student must learn certain facts concerning the Old and the New Testaments; he must have an idea of the religious opinions of other nations and the philosophic thought which is the basis of the theology of his time. Then, when he enters upon his duty, he will receive his practical experience; this is not the task of the university. Secondly there is the opinion which starts from the fact that the minister should be able to deal with the practical facts of life. What matters it if he has learned all there is to be known about the Apocalypse or the Book of Malachi, if he cannot manage his Sunday school, or attract the people by his preaching?

It is sufficiently difficult to decide in this case. Surely our ministers must be theologians, and where are they to get their theological knowledge unless the university gives it to them? There is so much to be learned, that in the four years of academical preparation they can only start on their road. . . . But, where shall they receive the practical preparation which is likewise so much needed? Without it a man will surely meet with a great

number of difficulties in the beginning of his career. He may have to waste a good deal of time in trying to acquire it. How shall we combine theory and practice, for combined they must be ?

If there is a way of solving the difficulty, I am certain that the so-called large university is *not* the sought for solution. The large university has its place in the world. It is the great storehouse of knowledge, a power-house where the scientific energy is created which will set into motion the rest of the world. It is of undeniable advantage to come into contact with it ; but surely it is not the place where one should go to lay the foundations for his future ministerial career. The large university can fill the head, but it cannot form the character. . . . In the University of Berlin there were two years ago about fourteen thousand students, a goodly portion of whom were theologians. I do not know the exact number of theological students, but it is safe to say that there were fifteen hundred. It is clear that it was absolutely impossible for the professors to come into close contact with the men ; in fact they did not even know them. . . . The large university may take its place as a graduate school, the foundation must be laid somewhere else.

It is my firm opinion that the best preparatory institution for the ministry is the small theological school, if that school happens to have a strong faculty. Here, for many reasons, the future minister will receive the best training both scientifically and practically. The classes are small, so that both professors and men may know each other thoroughly. The teaching loses its formal character and gains in intensity in consequence. We have here, not a professor speaking *ex cathedra* to a body of students who listen passively, but we have a common effort to reach a certain goal. The professor may adapt his teaching to the minds of the men, every one of whom he knows. The men in turn will feel free to ask for information after the lecture is over, or even while it is going on. Certainly from the point of view of scientific training, the small school has the advantage over the larger one.

It would seem equally true that with regard to the practical work a small school is preferable to a large institution. By practical training I do not mean merely preaching and Sunday school work, but a formation of character, a setting apart, a sanctification to the work which is to come. These future ministers are to be men in the full sense of the word, and still different from those who are about them. They are to be intensely interested in all things which concern humanity, but they are to look upon those things in a manner different from other people. In the midst of the world, but not of it ; men of flesh and blood and passions, yet consecrated to a high spiritual ideal, ministers have before them a task which is glorious but hard : too hard sometimes for those who are not strong. They must be trained by men who know all of the dangers which beset their path, and all of the victories which they may gain. Men who have struggled themselves till at last they have reached a high and safe place from which they may help others.

I meant to speak of the Meadville Theological School, but I thought it necessary first of all to state the great advantages of a small theological school as the best place in which a future minister may fit himself for his work.

The Meadville Theological School was established in the year 1844 at Meadville, Pennsylvania, United States of America. It is chartered as a school of religion, theology, and preparation for the ministry ; and it is open to young men and women of a good moral character and seriousness of purpose, with such a measure of ability and academic preparation as will afford a reasonable prospect of success in the work of the school.

Founded and endowed by Unitarians, it receives students of all denominations on equal terms ; it being provided in the charter that no doctrinal test shall ever be made a condition of enjoying any of the opportunities of the institution.

These words I quote from one of the quarterly bulletins which the school issues. They state in a simple manner what the school means to be, but they do not describe the school as it is in reality. They do not speak of the healthy spirit which reigns within its walls, nor of the influence which goes out from it and is felt in so many of our Unitarian churches in America.

Meadville, Pennsylvania, a charming little city in the midst of the hills, may be reached from New York by taking the Erie

Railway. It is quiet and peaceful, its principal charm being its beautiful surroundings. It is an excellent place for a theological school. It misses all of the disadvantages of a large city, but not wholly all of the advantages, for Erie, Buffalo, Cleveland, and Pittsburg may be reached very easily. The school itself is situated on one of the hills in the close vicinity of the town. It consists of three buildings, but we hope that soon there may be more.

First of all there is Divinity Hall, the largest building on the grounds. It is the home of the unmarried students; and a good home it has been for all who have lived there. It contains rooms for the students, the chapel, two lecture rooms, and a reading room. It is a pleasant place, well heated and well lighted.

Across the way we have the library. It contains about 32,000 volumes, which are under the care of our librarian, Rev. Walter C. Green. The library is well furnished with books, and thoroughly up-to-date. Additions (from funds) are made at frequent intervals. One room is set apart for books of general reference and departmental collections, and is open to students day and evening. The library is getting somewhat too small for the number of books. It will be necessary to erect a new building within a few years.

The latest addition to our school is Hunnewell Hall. In it we find a large and well equipped gymnasium, a bowling alley, and the beautiful dining-room. This building is used for social events, which occur frequently throughout the year; for this purpose it is very well adapted. Behind this building we find the tennis courts, which are being constantly used by the students and their friends.

Life in the school is absolutely free from unnecessary rules and restrictions. Everything is left to the honour of the men. It is expected, of course, that the students shall attend regularly the chapel services and the lectures.

The day begins at 8 o'clock, when breakfast is served in Hunnewell Hall. At 8-45 all assemble for prayers. The pleasant little service lasts about a quarter of an hour, and is led by students and professors in turn; it is a most fitting beginning to the day's work. At 9 o'clock the classes meet; they are continued throughout the morning and a part of the afternoon. Afternoon lectures are not very popular anywhere—Meadville is no exception to that rule. Our librarian, who arranges the schedule, has made a brave effort to leave the afternoon free; he has partly succeeded. At one o'clock the men come together for luncheon in Hunnewell Hall, while dinner is served at 6 o'clock in the same place.

This is a mere formal description of the course of the day. To those who have been at Meadville these bare outlines would soon take a more definite shape. Round every detail would at once gather a number of remembrances of some of the happiest years of our lives. We should still see before our eyes the small chapel where we have heard so many stimulating words, the church in the town, the houses of our friends which were open to us at all times. Some of the lectures I heard I can remember as if they were spoken yesterday; they gave us not a mass of dead detail but life itself and the great problems which it offers to living men. Some of the great lecturers who came to us from outside I can see before me even now. Every year brought from all parts of the world visitors, who spoke to us of matters which were of *world* interest. One could not stay long in our school and still be narrow minded.

The number of students is never very large, but the quality of the men is good, and in many cases above the average. From all parts of the world they have come together to do the same work. I have known times when there were representatives of nine different nations: the University of Kolosvar (Hungary) and one of the Indian universities send us one of their men every year.

One of the remarkable things about the school is the missionary spirit which it seems to inculcate in the hearts of all who study there. A number of churches have been started about Meadville, mostly by the students. Some of them are still small, but others have grown to be prosperous movements which increase in strength every year. During the summer a great many men have taken temporary charge of small parishes, mostly in the New England States.

A great *practical* advantage of Meadville is the fact that the expenses are low. Young men rooming in Divinity Hall pay

$20 annually toward the cost of heating and lighting their rooms during the entire school year of thirty-six weeks; there is no fee for instruction. The Hunnewell Hall Dining Association provides full board for $3 a week. Board and lodging thus amount to $128 a year. Books may be had at low rates through the co-operative society. Promising students may receive pecuniary assistance to the extent of $100 a year, on condition of rendering certain services, either to the library or some other department of the institution. Applicants who have attained a high rank during the preceding year are eligible to scholarships of $125 each. Prizes amounting to $180 annually are awarded for excellence in oratory and for proficiency in Hebrew. . . . I have heard President Southworth say that at no time would a promising man have to leave Meadville for lack of money; this I know to be absolutely true.

No special course of preparation is required for admission; the faculty judges the case of every applicant on its own merits. The course of instruction extends over a period of three years for those who hold the degree of Bachelor of Arts; for others a fourth year is added.

The work which is done at Meadville ranks very highly. The catalogue [prospectus] will show that a great deal of emphasis is put upon theoretical knowledge; those who have studied at the school know that the practical training is not forgotten. A good deal of attention is paid to preaching and Sunday school work. A number of men are engaged in our local Sunday school under the personal supervision of our excellent superintendent, Professor Frank C. Doan. Lectures on the subject of Sunday school work are given from time to time by authorities on the subject.

I might continue to speak about the school, for there is still a great deal to be said. I might tell of the visits of the sociology class to the neighbouring big cities, of the Cruft Travelling Fellowship which yields $810 a year and enables one of the Meadville graduates to study at one of the European universities for one or two years, but I fear that my article might become too long.

In finishing let me say this: Meadville is to my mind the type of theological school which answers exactly to the needs of our time It is not too large and it has a strong faculty. It believes that theological questions should be met in a scientific way, which after all means the only true way. It does *not* believe, however, in theology as an end in itself, but only as a means to a greater end—the eternal good of mankind. Man and his needs we were taught to look upon as the goal which continually we should keep before our eyes. Everything else was to be secondary to that.

The spreading of such ideals must result in good; our churches and the world at large will profit by it. The emphasis must be removed from the far off to the near at hand, from the problematical to the real; God must be served through man. A school which teaches such things must succeed in what it undertakes, because the world needs what it has to give.

I truly wish that some of our men on this side of the Atlantic[1] might go to Meadville either to study there or to take a post-graduate course. Their vision would be widened by it; their love for humanity deepened, and their faith in the final victory of our great liberal ideas would be strengthened.

Our Sunday schools exist to set boys and girls on their way to the knowledge of God, and to the glories of the independent life of the spirit. All mortals are not made of the same stuff, nor cast in the same mould. Some can lead, most find it easier to follow; but some can neither lead nor follow. We maintain our schools for the equipment of leaders, the preparation of intelligent followers. If we do not always succeed, if some pitiable creatures make shipwreck of their lives, we lament our failure and admit that with all the variety of endeavour which we bring to bear there are still more wonderful creatures in God's world than we can deal with; but that our method is wrong we do not admit. Let its scope be widened: then all will be well. We try to enunciate principles of action, even as Jesus did. He made some failures, but we do not condemn his method in consequence. To us it was the right method. So we go on trying to win souls for good life; helpful citizenship, and godliness. If we faint it is because we look at our failures and do not take courage from the contemplation of our successes. The carnal nature in us says, 'You've done enough; take it easy and let somebody else have a try'; drowning the voice of the spiritual nature which says 'Go on, you'll do better next time.' No man thinking of the lads whom he has helped to stand upon their feet but feels that he wants to do likewise again.

[1] Mr. Auer writes from Harderwijk on the Zuider Zee.

THE TEACHING OF RELIGION IN SUNDAY SCHOOLS

The North Midland Scheme

ALBERT THORNHILL, M.A.

THE above title may raise hopes in the reader's mind which I am eager at the outset to dispel. The article which follows does not profess to offer a solution of the hard and pressing problems that confront the Sunday school teacher. Briefly that problem is, how best to utilise the precious Sunday hours to educate religiously the six or seven million boys and girls who present themselves week by week for instruction in this vital and abstruse field of study. If we as a nation were faced with this problem for the first time, and could set about it, unhampered by the conditions that now retard us, I am certain that we should deal with it in a very different way from the present. We should not stint it for funds, or *materiel*; we should insist upon the training of our teachers; perhaps we should pay them an adequate stipend; we should certainly demand that a definite course of study should be pursued bearing directly upon the religious emotions, and the fundamental part they fulfil in life and character. Ideally speaking, of course, such training is the most sacred duty of parenthood; but like many another parental obligation this most serious charge is gradually being shifted from the shoulders of fathers and mothers to those of ministers and voluntary workers, and I do not think I am in the least exaggerating the facts when I estimate that quite half of the rising generation depend almost entirely for such religious influences as enter into their lives upon Sunday school teachers. In saying this I am not ignoring the value of the scripture studies pursued in the day schools; though that value is not, to my thinking, high. Such studies do not tend to awaken the moral and religious emotions. At the best they fix in the memory certain texts of Scripture which the wise Sunday school teacher may illuminate and vivify, or which may flash forth their deeper meaning in some later crisis; but at the worst—and I have known such cases—these lessons may engender, even in the very young, an aversion from scripture study amounting to nausea—a result at once pitiful and saddening. In no case can day school teaching be regarded as an efficient substitute for the holy influence of religious training in the home; for those Bible stories told in a nursery paraphrase that makes the narrative live; or for those matchless parables read by a revered parent and interpreted by a loved life; and, least of all, for the prayers lisped by infant lips in the evening stillness under the benediction of a mother's hand. Indeed, can *any*thing be an efficient substitute for this sacred home atmosphere? Certainly not the essentially secular air of the day school where the primary object must needs be the training of the intelligence; and where classes of sixty or more make impossible that close personal intimacy between teacher and child which is the first pre-requisite of any attempt at soul-culture. Hence those sovereign faculties of wonder, awe, and adoration which crave expression in the child, are only imperfectly appealed to; the region of the spiritual is never approached; and the awful monitions of conscience and the high responsibilities of the will are only incidentally appealed to. And do we not all recognise that it is in these, all but neglected, regions of our inner life, that the issues of life and death are fought out and determined? We have arrived, therefore, at this important, if not astounding position, that because so many parents neglect these most sacred responsibilities the Sunday school teachers must now stand *in loco parentis* to nearly half the children of the land, or see them go hungry for want of the bread of life. How can we fulfil this grave responsibility?

The North Midland Sunday School Association's scheme does not profess to answer this question; and yet, because it has come into being through a frank recognition of the pressing nature of the problem and its conditions, some explanation of the scheme will interest all who feel the sacredness of Sunday school work.

Some eighteen months ago our Association began to realise that its work was not done when it had met in Annual Conference and appointed visitors to make friendly calls at its various schools. Several of its officers confessed to a feeling of sorrowful dismay that no systematic attempt was being made gradually to unfold and

draw forth into maturity the native religious instincts of the children. One or two schools were, indeed, groping after a system, though not strictly on lines of religious development; in most of our seventeen schools careful and conscientious work was being done, though there was lacking any element of continuity and gradation; in every school good was being accomplished. Still haphazard reading from story books was not unknown; and the lack of any definite system of religious study led us to realise that a child might pass through a Sunday school with only a very fragmentary acquaintance with the Bible, a very imperfect conception of the personal and social implications and demands of the gospel, and no knowledge at all of the basic principles of religion. Such a pupil naturally presents an easy prey to the specious arguments of popular writers on materialism; and, what is far more deplorable, he may have no clear and intelligible principles to present to his own consciousness in hours of stress, as to why he ought to prefer the spiritual, the religious, the social and altruistic course, rather than the selfish and the worldly.

I am here articulating feelings which were more or less openly hinted at by my fellow-teachers in our North Midland district, and which I believe are not unknown to conscientious teachers in other districts. We recognised the sacred responsibilities of our work; we became conscious of our imperfect methods and inadequate equipment; and we eagerly desired to adopt some plan which would ensure the systematic teaching of religion to every child passing through our classes.

Of course when schemes of graduated study were suggested some wise ones shook their heads and bade us beware lest we interfered with the sacred freedom of our teachers. We persevered. Our energetic secretary, Rev. F. Heming Vaughan after an exhaustive inquiry gathered information concerning all the schemes of the various associations in the British Isles, some of them—sad thought—being resurrected for our special benefit. This to many seemed ominous of the fate of any scheme we might devise; in fact, judged by statistics of past failures, the outlook for any united project seemed rather saddening. I cannot recollect the exact statistics, and, as I am writing this in holiday hours beside the sounding sea at Ventnor, my papers are not available; but I do recall the fact that at the Easter Meeting at Chesterfield in 1909 we had a stiff fight to prevent the enterprise from being strangled prematurely owing to the discouraging facts which reached us from other districts.

We staved off defeat, however, and a small sub-committee was appointed to learn by the failures of others; and if possible to do better.

The result of their deliberations was the experimental scheme, which I will try to describe.

Three things which the sub-committee sought to realise by the scheme should first be emphasised.

First and foremost they aimed at guiding, informing, and encouraging the teacher.

In the second place, they sought to bring home to every child the personal and social implications of religion, as exemplified by the teaching and example of Jesus Christ.

And, lastly, they deemed it desirable that no child should pass through our schools without knowing something of the main outlines of the religious history of our own country—not merely as history but as exemplifying, in the lives of our heroes and martyrs, the great principles of the Christian religion, and the struggle for the liberty 'to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience' on matters appertaining to faith.

All will acknowledge that if these great objects could be even approximately attained in all our schools we should at once be rid of half our ills. We felt that at any rate we must begin the attempt. And so we drafted a scheme of twenty-four lessons—twelve designed to begin the second part of our object, and twelve to begin the third. Both series are *mere beginnings*, and should be judged as such.

The series dealing with the personal and social implications of Christianity was selected from the book 'The Practical Teaching of Jesus, as set forth in the Gospel according to St. Matthew,' by Rev. Arthur W. Fox. For those who would like to follow the scheme in detail I give the chapters in that book from which the lessons were taken:—i, ii, iii, iv, viii, x, xiv, xxi, xxiv, xxviii, xxix, xxxiv. Briefly I may say these chapters com-

prehend the chief beatitudes, the golden rule, the Lord's Prayer, the lofty injunction of the Master as to the saving of life by losing it, one or two of the parables, and Peter's denial. This is a sparse minimum for any scheme, but it contains the kernel of Christian teaching.

It must be borne in mind, that though Mr. Fox's book was selected as a basis, because of its splendid collection of illustrations so admirably adapted for junior classes, the promoters of the scheme urged that it should NOT be read in class. They most strongly insisted upon the teachers meeting together once a week in conference, if possible under the guidance of the minister, and so mastering the underlying principles of the lessons, that they would be able to face their classes on the Sunday without the book, and adapt the lessons, with fresh illustrations if necessary, suited to the respective ages of their scholars. To encourage the teachers in this definite work of preparation the Association was induced to offer very substantial prizes for the best essays written by teachers on ' The Social Implications of the Gospel.' All the teachers who send in essays are recommended first to read the little book on ' Jesus of Nazareth', by Etienne Giran, and Peabody's popular work on ' Jesus Christ and the Social Question.' They must be certified as having taught *both* parts of the scheme in their classes. The winner of the first prize, it may be added, will have the privilege of attending the Summer Session of Sunday school teachers at Oxford, free of expense, and so prosecuting his or her studies further.

So far I have dealt with only half of the scheme. The remaining portion consists of twelve selected lessons from Dr. Brooke Herford's ' Story of Religion in England.' Here the work of selection proved very difficult because, while the book is admirably suited for elder classes, it is by no means easily adaptable for juniors. And yet no stories are more thrilling, or more rich in religious lessons, and none appeal to children more than those of the martyr spirits of our religious history. Here again we felt the need of a book that should gather together a score or more of brief biographies of heroes like Wyclif, and Tyndale, and Latimer, and Ridley, and Fox, and Bidle, and Baxter, and Bunyan, and the Pilgrim Fathers, and John Wesley, and Priestley, and Lindsey, and others who have died or suffered in their witness for liberty of conscience. Such a book, written in simple language, would be of immense service in the hands of faithful teachers in engendering the same passion in the breasts of the young, and in fostering that reverence for the shining lights of all churches which is the first step to a reasoned appreciation of their own. Lacking this much-needed volume, we selected our lessons as far as possible on biographical lines, and decided to confine ourselves to the main outlines of religious development in England, from the Reformation to our own day. Experience has proved that this was too wide a period to bring within the scope of a dozen lessons ; still, given the right books, adapted to various ages, we feel that this important period of our religious history could be presented to both junior and senior classes in a way to excite much interest and to convey the most noble lessons. The method of treatment will best be gathered from the following hints to teachers, and the model lessons for junior and senior classes, which were sent out to all the teachers in the schools of the Association :—

Hints for Teachers.

The Scheme makes preparation essential. An hour a week is the minimum necessary for reading, which should cover, where possible, not only the selected chapter in the text book, but reference to a good general history, e.g., Bright's English History for Public Schools, Vols. II and III ; or Green's Short History of the English People ; or Oxford Manuals of English History, Vols. IV, V, VI. If these are not accessible in School or Public Libraries, a small chronology should be the constant companion of the reader.

Having read the chapter for the week, and consulted the General History for further information, it is suggested that the following method of presenting the lesson be adopted :—

1. Give brief biographical sketches of the leading personalities.
2. Describe the social and religious issues which confronted them.
3. Relate how they acted, and with what results.
4. Make the point last reached the starting point for the next lesson.

Example for Senior Classes.

LESSON I.—Chapter 17, pp. 147–157. THE BEGINNING OF THE REFORMATION.

1. BIOGRAPHICAL.—How did Wyclif, Colet, Erasmus, Henry VIII, and Thomas Cromwell contribute to the movement?
2. ISSUES.—Shall the people have the Bible? Who is the head of the Church? Note the influence of the re-birth of learning, and the invention of printing.
3. HOW THE ISSUES WERE SOLVED.—Wyclif gave the people the Bible; Colet gave the children knowledge; Erasmus gave Europe the Greek Testament; Henry VIII threw off the Roman yoke; Cromwell swept away monasteries and Abbeys, e.g., Furness Abbey, Tintern Abbey.

Example for Junior Classes.

LESSON II.—Chapter 18. TYNDALE, FATHER OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

1. TYNDALE'S TIMES—
   (*a*) Henry VIII and the Pope. (*b*) Erasmus; the Printing Press. (*c*) No Bible in English.
2. TYNDALE'S TASK—
   (*a*) Studies at Oxford and Cambridge. (*b*) Opposition of the Clergy. (*c*) His resolve: to translate the Bible into 'common English.'
3. TYNDALE TRANSLATING—
   (*a*) At work in London. (*b*) Goes to Continent. (*c*) Prints New Testament.
4. TYNDALE'S TRIUMPH—
   (*a*) His New Testament eagerly bought in England. (*b*) Starts on Old Testament and improves his New Testament Version. (*c*) Opposition to English Bible overcome; Coverdale authorised to translate. (*d*) He uses the version of Tyndale, which thus becomes the foundation of our Authorised Version. (*e*) Tyndale's Martyrdom in Belgium: his last words, 'Lord, open the King of England's eyes.'

In connection with this part of the scheme also an essay was asked for from the teachers, the subject being 'The Ejection of the Two Thousand in 1662.' The reading for this essay is a little wider than for the ordinary lessons, and hints on this subject also accompany the scheme outlined above.

In connection with both parts of the scheme an examination is shortly to be held for those scholars who are willing to face the ordeal. These may not be numerous, for the scheme has only taken root in about a third of the schools, but, obviously, the success of the enterprise cannot be tested by numerical results. The object aimed at from first to last has been to reach the scholars through the informed minds of the teachers, and to appeal directly to their religious instincts and emotions. In those schools in which the scheme has been tried this has been attained; for at Chesterfield, Derby, Hinckley, Leicester, Mansfield, and Nottingham, and possibly elsewhere, regular conferences on the scheme have taken place between the ministers and teachers, from which both have derived inspiration and help. The scheme has some defects, and its promoters are probably more conscious of these than their critics; but, profiting by experience, it is hoped to make it the basis of a graduated system of religious instruction which may prove more widely acceptable.

Oberlin, the well-known philanthropist of Steinthal, while yet a candidate for the ministry, was travelling on one occasion from Strasbourg. It was in the winter time. The ground was deeply covered with snow, and the roads were almost impassable. He had reached the middle of his journey and was among the mountains, but by that time was so exhausted that he could stand up no longer. He was rapidly freezing to death. Sleep overcame him; all power to resist it left him. He commended himself to God, and yielded to what he felt to be the sleep of death.

He knew not how long he slept, but suddenly became conscious of some one rousing him and waking him up. Before him stood a waggon driver, in his blue blouse, and the waggon not far away. He gave him a little wine and food, and the spirit of life returned. He then helped him on the waggon and brought him to the next village. The rescued man was profuse in his thanks, and offered money, which his benefactor refused.

'It is only a duty to help one another,' said the waggoner, 'and it is the next thing to an insult to offer a reward for such a service.'

'Then,' replied Oberlin, 'at least tell me your name, that I may have you in thankful remembrance before God.'

'I see,' said the waggoner, 'that you are a minister of the Gospel; please tell me the name of the good Samaritan.'

'That,' said Oberlin, 'I cannot do, for it was not put on record.'

'Then,' replied the waggoner, 'until you can tell me his name, permit me to withhold mine.'

Soon he had driven out of sight, and Oberlin never saw him again.

If you feel prompted to an unnoticed act of kindness, do not hold back because it will be unnoticed! Ask yourself—What was the name of the good Samaritan?

BY THE WAY

LIFE IN EARNEST, by Gertrude Martineau. S.S.A., Essex Hall, Strand. Price 1/-.

This book consists of twenty-nine addresses to children. They all appeared in the 'Children's Column' in the *Inquirer*, and were so much appreciated that they have now been issued in book form. It is easy to understand why they were valued so highly by readers and teachers especially. There is nothing forced or artificial in them—they are real lessons with real points. Few children will fail to grasp their meaning—the stories are told skilfully and with a fine insight into the needs of children.

There is acute perception of the stages through which children pass, and of the world as it appears to their small, eager, inquiring minds.

The addresses are all of the strong order—there is no weak or merely sentimental lesson enforced. They all make for character building.

The children are made to see why they should be wide awake in a living world, and why self-control is good and obedience to good laws necessary. The arguments are human and belong to the child's sphere—the illustrations are clear and apt.

The charm of the book is its sympathetic tone—the children's difficulties and temptations are entered into and analysed, and then the way out and the means of conquering reveal themselves so simply that the appeal cannot be resisted. High ground is taken throughout the book—there is no selfish teaching in these addresses.

No child can become self-centred by hearing them—the lesson of love runs through all.

The children are treated not as mere units but as growing members of a world of children.

The interests of others always stand alongside of the good of each child.

Many a lesson would be helpful to more than children, for the dominant aim is to build life upon a foundation of love.

For teachers who prepare their own lessons for children this book can be confidently recommended as a model in style and method, and for those who have neither time nor ability to make such preparation, this little book will be found most valuable and helpful.

* * *

VISITING.—No school can afford to neglect its absentees. At the most, no scholar should be able to absent himself three Sundays in succession without receiving a call either from his teacher or a member of the visiting committee. Teachers themselves make the best visitors, but where they cannot generally undertake the duty a committee should be appointed. Visiting is not a function that can be left to anybody: it requires tact, patience, and a knowledge of the home conditions in which scholars live. Regular meetings of the visiting committee, whether composed of teachers or others, are important if the visits are to be productive of the best results. Knowledge possessed by one ought often to be made common property among the members of the committee: if it were, many a modification of method and practice would result. One reason for the lack of method observable in so many schools is that there is no school 'clearing-house.' The advice of the minister, who knows so much better than anybody else the home conditions of his people, should be sought without hesitation; indeed, he is the proper chairman of the committee of visitors. One of the needs of the visitor is a good card of invitation to the school, which might be left with parents and others, setting forth the societies and meetings of the school, and, in a businesslike way, making known the wide variety of its interests. Unitarian schools are not the worst supplied in the matter of societies!

* * *

LETTER FROM THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF CARLISLE:—

Dear Mr. Marshall,

I read your article on Temperance Teaching in the April number of the SUNDAY SCHOOL QUARTERLY with great satisfaction.

I believe that it is impossible to exaggerate the value of this teaching, particularly at the present time, when the State has at last recognised the necessity of teaching children as to the gravest dangers that will await them in life, and as far as possible of protecting them from them—but though I do not wish at all to undervalue the possible benefits of this new departure, I cannot help fearing that either the department or the local education authorities may tone down and minimise this instruction so as to please those who advocate what they call moderation rather than that total abstinence in which we believe real safety only lies.

I hope that I may be mistaken in this—but in any case I am convinced that scientific and medical information, however sound, will not take the place of those inducements of religion and of citizenship which you have so well put forward at the very beginning of your article. The hygienic curriculum, however well it may be given in the elementary schools, requires the teaching which can best be given in the Sunday school to make it a practical force. In this undertaking I wish you all possible success.

Yours truly, CARLISLE.

* * *

AN ACUTE OBSERVER writes:—Are we doing anything to restore confidence in the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Christ? Will the making of our Sunday schools into rudimentary gambling hells, by organising whist drives and raffles, restore it? I am afraid not. The curse of gambling is more rampant than the curse of drinking; but what a spectacle for the gods it would be to find churches and Sunday schools offering bottles of whiskey, as prizes for skill in playing cards or dominoes. You might as well expect to gather grapes from thorns as look for political regeneracy from billiard cues, or the spread of Christianity through the agency of the king of spades or the knave of clubs.

* * *

By the course of events our churches have been set apart from the rest of the religious world, and there has been assigned to them specific work which their members cannot afford to leave undone. Whether the world is coming our way or not, and whether there will sometime in the future be an evident reason why Unitarian churches should be disbanded or united with

other religious bodies or not, the responsibility remains to-day, and no good work done in our churches now will be lost or wasted when the future accounting comes. An evident truth is that now our churches are not doing one-half of that which they might do to renovate society and bring all our institutions into line with the currents of spiritual energy which flow on for ever, whether men heed them or not.—*Christian Register.*

* * *

MEMORIES OF A SUMMER HOLIDAY (Essex Hall 3d.), by Ronald P. Jones and John C. Ballantyne, is worth distributing among the boys in our Schools who are at the age when order and obedience are making claims upon their intelligence. The illustrations are excellent. This booklet should lead to the recommendation of the B.O.B. in many quarters. Workers amongst boys can have a number of copies at a reduced rate.

* * *

I used to have 'tussles' with children at school, but I found it was a very good plan, *before* I resorted to strong measures, to go out of the room for a minute or two in order to find out if I was in a bad temper or not; when I came back I usually found all I had to say was 'You'll do what I want you to do, won't you?' The quiet interval was good for the child as well as for me. I never found it a good plan with an obstinate child, to let him know I was in any way matching my will with his; to say, for instance, 'I shall not move from here till you've done what I told you to do'; or, 'I shall show you who's the mistress here,' etc., etc., etc. You may *think* that sort of thing, but I do not see that it does any good to *say* it.

* * *

THE PSALMS AND THEIR MAKERS.—It is refreshing to know that the old dread of Biblical criticism high and low is passing away. Folks are realising that salvation is not bound up with belief in the inspirational validity of Balaam's ass. Such a book as *The Psalms and their Makers* by Theodora Nunns (David Nutt, 3/- net), is a welcome confirmation of the liberal spirit in the Church of England, for it is an attempt to represent to the ordinary lay mind the critical conclusions of Dr. Briggs in his work on the Psalms. It makes a limited appeal in the curious indifference of Theodora Nunns to the large body of opinion outside the Anglican Church. It may be that the author desires her little book to be read only by the members of her own communion, in which case we can understand her continued references to the Prayer-book, the Church of England services, and 'our' parish church. But we should imagine that the Psalms make such a catholic appeal to the heart of humanity that, in the study of their historical relations, all petty limitations of sects and denominations would be merged in a wide-minded concern for the deep spiritual needs and emotions of mankind. Doubtless there are many unto whom *The Psalms and their Makers* will be a help. For those who care not to wrestle with learned critical commentaries, but who yet desire to acquire reliable information regarding these ancient utterances of penitence and praise, the work may be of considerable value. But we confess that the loose English, the attempts at fanciful writing, and the obvious limitations of the author's position repel us. There is room for such a work as Theodora Nunns has attempted, for in the wider knowledge of the purely human settings of the Psalms, our hearts will be moved to spiritual comradeship with the singers of olden times. But that we have in her book just what is required we doubt.

* * *

THE SELECT TALES OF HAWTHORNE, J. Tinkler (Thomas Murby & Co., Price 1/-).

On the value of anthologies there may be diversity of opinions. Selected passages from great authors may indicate a direction in which enjoyment may be found, or they may but create a dilettante spirit, content with having read a condensed classic and received wisdom in a concentrated form.

But an anthology such as Mr. Tinkler has provided has a value beyond the mere selection of passages, which are indeed well chosen—it serves as an excuse for writing a short and pithy criticism of the position of his chosen author in the scheme of literary things.

Mr. Tinkler provides us, in a handy form, with a criticism, a bibliography, a chronological table, a portrait, and an anthology of Nathaniel Hawthorne, the robust romancer of the Transcendentalists. He surely leads us rather to deeper study than to divine content. He contrives to create in us a new respect for the wonderful group of American writers, for Longfellow, Emerson, Thoreau, Bronson Alcott, and the entire group whose names are associated with Brook Farm, Concord, and the new spirit of freedom and fervour. He invites comparison between Lamb and Hawthorne, both in style and occupation; and also between Bunyan and Hawthorne in allegory. He even enters into the region of philosophy, and leads to a discussion on the values of utilitarianism and the pure imagination of the romancer.

Perhaps Hawthorne is not the best-known and most widely read of modern authors, but the charm of his life should surely appeal to the modern age, when there is a growing tendency to infuse life with an atmosphere of imagination, of poetry, of romance—a new chivalry. To-day, perhaps, Concord, Brook Farm, and Walden appeal more to the natures of men than they did fifty years ago. Even if this be not so in fact, in theory the time is ripe for such an appreciation, and if Mr. Tinkler's book serves the purpose of introducing the world anew to a novelist who is also an apostle of Transcendentalism, it will at least have opened new channels for a current which is ready to flow.

* * *

The Next Number of the SUNDAY SCHOOL QUARTERLY will contain contributions from Revs. R. P. Farley, Arthur W. Fox, Wilfrid Harris, Mr. W. R. Marshall, and Rev. J. H. Weatherall.

* * *

THE BOOKS OF THE BIBLE DATED is a useful pamphlet by Rev. W. Copeland Bowie. Teachers will do well to send for a copy from Essex Hall.